

Weekly Compilation of
**Presidential
Documents**



Monday, May 3, 1993
Volume 29—Number 17
Pages 667–723

Contents

Addresses and Remarks

House Ways and Means Committee—710
Justice Department employees—711
National Drug Control Policy Office Director, announcement—703
National Realtors Association—691
NCAA champion basketball teams—698
Newspaper Association of America, Boston, MA—670
President's Task Force on National Health Care Reform, reception—714
Radio address—668
Russian election—689
University of Arkansas champion track team—688

Appointments and Nominations

See also Statements by the President
Education Department, Assistant Secretary—709
Energy Department, Energy Information Administration, Administrator—709
Justice Department, Assistant Attorneys General—711
National Drug Control Policy Office, Director—703
Navy Department, General Counsel—703
Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development, Ambassador—691
Securities and Exchange Commission, Chairman—709
State Department, Ambassadors—703

Bill Signings

Emergency supplemental appropriations legislation, statement—668

Communications to Congress

Additional measures with respect to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro), message—687
Cyprus conflict report, letter—667
Export control regulations continuation report, message—700
Nonproliferation in South Asia report, letter transmitting—707

Executive Orders

Additional Measures With Respect to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro)—685

Interviews With the News Media

Exchanges with reporters
East Room—689
Roosevelt Room—710
Rose Garden—703
Newspaper Association of America—679

Meetings With Foreign Leaders

See Statements Other Than Presidential

Proclamations

Death of Cesar Chavez—709
Jewish Heritage Week—707
National Crime Victims' Rights Week—708
National Day of Prayer—718

(Continued on the inside of the back cover.)

Editor's Note: The President was in New Orleans, LA, on April 30, the closing date of this issue. Releases and announcements issued by the Office of the Press Secretary but not received in time for inclusion in this issue will be printed next week.

WEEKLY COMPILATION OF

PRESIDENTIAL DOCUMENTS

Published every Monday by the Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration, Washington, DC 20408, the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* contains statements, messages, and other Presidential materials released by the White House during the preceding week.

The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* is published pursuant to the authority contained in the Federal Register Act (49 Stat. 500, as amended; 44 U.S.C. Ch. 15), under

regulations prescribed by the Administrative Committee of the Federal Register, approved by the President (37 FR 23607; 1 CFR Part 10).

Distribution is made only by the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. The *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents* will be furnished by mail to domestic subscribers for \$80.00 per year (\$137.00 for mailing first class) and to foreign subscribers for \$93.75 per year, payable to the Superintendent of Documents, Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402. The charge for a single copy is \$3.00 (\$3.75 for foreign mailing).

There are no restrictions on the republication of material appearing in the *Weekly Compilation of Presidential Documents*.

Contents—Continued

Statements by the President

See also Appointments and Nominations; Bill Signings
March for gay rights—685
National commission on the airline industry—717

Statements Other Than Presidential

President's meeting with the Dalai Lama—709

Supplementary Materials

Acts approved by the President—723
Checklist of White House press releases—723
Digest of other White House announcements—719
Nominations submitted to the Senate—720

Week Ending Friday, April 30, 1993

**Letter to Congressional Leaders
Reporting on the Cyprus Conflict**
April 21, 1993

Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. Chairman:)

In accordance with Public Law 95-384 (22 U.S.C. 2373(c)), I am submitting to you this bimonthly report on progress toward a negotiated settlement of the Cyprus question. The previous report, sent to you by President Bush, covered September, October, and part of November 1992. The current report covers the remainder of November 1992 through February 14, 1993.

There were no further face-to-face negotiating sessions on the Cyprus issue from the time of the October 12, 1992, recess of the New York talks through February 14, 1993. During this period, which coincided with the campaign and Presidential election in the Republic of Cyprus, the U.N. Secretary General's negotiators and the U.S. Special Cyprus Coordinator, Ambassador John Maresca, and other U.S. officials remained in contact with the two Cypriot communities and the Governments of Greece and Turkey.

The previous report on this subject included Secretary General Boutros-Ghali's report on the October-November U.N. negotiating session and U.N. Security Council Resolution 789, which unanimously endorsed the Secretary General's report, including the confidence-building measures suggested therein. On November 24, 1992, President Vassiliou notified the Secretary General by letter that the Greek-Cypriot side accepted the Secretary General's report, including the confidence-building measures. The Turkish-Cypriot side reacted negatively to both the Secretary General's report and to Security Council Resolution 789.

On November 22, between the time of the issuance of the Secretary General's report and the passage of Security Council Resolu-

tion 789, U.S. Special Cyprus Coordinator Maresca visited Ankara and Athens and discussed the report and the resolution that was then being drafted in New York. Ambassador Maresca had further discussions in Washington with representatives of the two Cypriot sides as well as with the Turkish Embassy. Ambassador Maresca informed all concerned that he would not visit Cyprus during the Cypriot election campaign.

In early December, during a regular visit to the Eastern Mediterranean area, the Director of the State Department's European Bureau, Office of Southern European Affairs, discussed the Cyprus negotiations with the leaders of both Cypriot communities on the island and with officials of the Governments of Greece and Turkey.

The election campaign in Cyprus continued into February 1993. On February 7, the first round of the election did not produce a majority for any candidate. One week later, on February 14, the last day covered by this report, the two candidates with the most votes in the first round—the incumbent, President George Vassiliou, and Mr. Glafcos Clerides—faced each other in a runoff election. Mr. Clerides won the runoff by about 2,000 votes.

I would like to take the opportunity of my first letter on the Cyprus dispute to reiterate my strong commitment to press hard for a lasting solution to the tragedy of Cyprus. I intend to give that goal a high priority in my Administration. The U.N. "set of ideas" for a bizonal and bicomunal federation with a single national sovereignty and identity continues to offer the best chance for a peaceful resolution of this dispute. I urge both President Clerides, in his new capacity as the leader of the Greek-Cypriot community, and Mr. Denktash, the leader of the Turkish-Cypriot community, to continue their participation in the U.N.-sponsored negotiations and to be

ready when the talks resume to make the political decisions necessary to resolve this long-standing dispute in a way that is acceptable and beneficial to all Cypriots.

Sincerely,

Bill Clinton

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Thomas S. Foley, Speaker of the House of Representatives, and Claiborne Pell, Chairman of the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. This item was not received in time for publication in the appropriate issue.

Statement on Signing Emergency Supplemental Appropriations Legislation

April 23, 1993

Today I have signed into law H.R. 1335, the "Emergency Supplemental Appropriations" Act of 1993. This Act provides \$4 billion in emergency unemployment compensation to approximately 1.9 million unemployed American workers. This critical assistance will help the unemployed and their families with grocery bills, mortgage payments and other expenses while they seek new employment. I am disappointed that the job-producing elements of the original version of the legislation were forced to be removed from it.

Our efforts to create jobs, increase investment, and safeguard our communities and our children, were frustrated by the use of parliamentary tactics in the Senate in the furtherance of politics-as-usual. The losers, in the end, were jobless Americans looking for the dignity of employment, and communities across the United States looking forward to meeting unmet national needs through growth-oriented efforts provided by the legislation in its original form. It is my hope that the Congress will consider further legislation to produce the jobs that are needed to strengthen and sustain the current economic recovery.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
April 23, 1993.

NOTE: H.R. 1335, approved April 23, was assigned Public Law No. 103-24. This statement was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on April 24.

The President's Radio Address

April 24, 1993

Good morning. It's been said that to learn about democracy you can take a break from Plato and take the bus. I know firsthand that's good advice. It was on our bus tour last year that I met so many of the Americans who helped to chart our course toward tomorrow: fathers and mothers and children, citizens whose concerns are everyday concerns, the kind that unfortunately have been ignored for too long in this Capital City.

I heard worry in some of those voices and hope everywhere that new leadership could change our country for the better. That strengthened my resolve to beat back the status quo, to fight against special interest and politics as usual, to fight for the people who work hard and play by the rules. You put your faith in us so that we could put you, the American people, first. And that's what I try to do every day. In every battle I fight, I just try to keep you and your needs and the future of our great Nation in mind.

Even today I'm reminded of the work still to be done here. For many Americans the weekend is a time to unwind a bit, see friends, catch up with the family, do the shopping and other chores. Maybe some of you are out in the yard gardening or washing a car or tossing a softball or a frisbee.

I know there's been some good news lately. After about 100 days as President we've begun to change the direction of America. Our economic program has been adopted in its broad outlines by Congress. That's brought an end to trickle-down economics. The stock market is at an all-time high, and interest rates are very, very low, mortgages at a 20-year low. Many of you have already saved a lot of money just since the November election on these lower interest rates, with refinancing your home mortgages or getting car loans or consumer credit or perhaps business loans at lower rates. That's going to put billions and

billions of dollars back into this economy, which will create jobs and opportunities for people for years to come. I'm excited about that. We're also lowering the deficit with over 200 specific cuts in Government spending and tax increases, almost all of which are coming on people with incomes above \$100,000.

We're doing some other things, like taking steps to make more credit available to businesses and farms, supporting working families with children, developing a proposal to clean up our environment in a way that creates jobs rather than costs jobs, and working to invest for new jobs for those people who have been laid off by defense cuts.

These developments will all help to turn our country around and move us in the right direction. But still, for many Americans, this is just another day without a job and a cruel reminder that without gainful employment even the basics in life, including self-esteem, are hard to come by.

For those Americans I'll never stop fighting, because for all Americans the stakes go up whenever unemployment refuses to go down. Think about this: For 16 straight months the national unemployment rate has been 7 percent or higher. Just this week we saw the latest figures for unemployment claims, and it still wasn't good. There were 359,000 claims, an increase of 26,000.

And some say we're in a recovery. Well, the majority of the officials you elected to represent you in Washington know this is a serious situation. They know that every industrial nation in the world is having a big problem creating jobs. Most people understand we need action and bold changes to ensure that we get out of this cycle of job loss. How can anybody with a lick of sense think that we don't need more jobs?

Yet, still, this past week, a minority of the United States Senate, 43 Senators, played parliamentary games with our people's lives. They blocked an attempt to even vote on our plan to put Americans back to work. Instead of giving the majority the chance they wanted to pass the jobs bill, which would have put hundreds of thousands of Americans to work, they decided we should spend your tax dollars only to extend unemployment benefits.

I could think they don't understand. The 16 million Americans who want full-time jobs don't just want more handouts to get from week to week. They want work so they can support themselves and be independent and pay taxes instead of spending tax dollars.

The bill I proposed didn't create Democratic jobs or Republican jobs. And it certainly didn't create make-work jobs. It was a bill to create jobs building the fundamentals for long-term economic growth. It funded highway and mass transit constructions. It would have enabled inner-city and rural kids to get off the streets and go to work. It would have permitted hard-pressed communities to rehire as many as 10,000 police officers to enlist them in the fight against street crime. And these investments were paid for by more than 200 real spending cuts contained in the budget that Congress has already passed.

Of course, the best program is one that will help to generate jobs. That's the social program we really need. Think of it: If everybody in America who wanted a job had one, we wouldn't just be a more productive nation; we'd be a freer people, free of many of the problems in our society.

That's why I went the extra mile on this jobs program. I offered a compromise. I offered another compromise that met our opponents more than halfway, and why I still want to work with Congress, both Democrats and Republicans, to pass the details of our economic program and to create jobs.

Look what happened in the Senate. When the economy is looking weak, when the recovery isn't producing jobs, when you, the American people, are asking lawmakers to cut out the gridlock, the opponents of our program filibustered and literally prevented even a vote so that the majority could have worked its will. Well, a lot of those people think they've scored a victory by killing a chance to put nearly a half million Americans to work. I don't think that's much of a victory. I think that's letting the American people down. And I'm going to do my best not to let you down.

I've just been here in Washington a short time. We've made some big strides. Our budget blueprint has been approved by Congress in record time, and that's led to a

record reduction in interest rates. As I said earlier, a lot of you have already benefited from that, and that's going to release tens of billions of dollars to invest in this economy.

We're not going to play business as usual here. We're going to shift the course of this economy from consumption and waste to investment and growth. We're taking on some of the hardest problems facing America, such as changing the health care system to make it work for you and trying to drive special interest out of politics through campaign finance and lobbying reform. We're asking everyone to take more responsibility by reforming welfare so it's a second chance, not a way of life, by making our education system live up to strong national standards, by offering students a chance to go to college in exchange for community service, by forcing Federal Agencies to do more with a lot less of your money.

These are big changes. We all know they won't happen overnight. But we're on our way, thanks to the support you've given us. I want our debate on key issues like creating jobs to rise above politics, to rise above party and up to the level of the American people. Our only agenda should be your needs, the kind of needs you've been telling us about for a long time.

I'm still listening to you. And I'll keep on doing it. But all the people here in Washington are going to have to get on the bus. We can't miss the bus this time. We've got to be out there working for you to make this country what it ought to be.

Thank you.

NOTE: The address was recorded at 7:30 p.m. on April 23 in Room 453 of the Old Executive Office Building for broadcast at 10:06 a.m. on April 24.

Remarks to the Newspaper Association of America in Boston, Massachusetts

April 25, 1993

Thank you very much. Frank, I am delighted to be here. You reminded me, when you said that I came last year to the Waldorf, that I was in Los Angeles last year on the day before this convention. And I was flying back, and I got somewhere around Las

Vegas, and our plane malfunctioned. We had to go back to California, and I took the red-eye into the Waldorf. I've always thought that was why I was the first Democrat in 28 years to receive a majority of the newspaper endorsements in the last election. I was thinking today whether there was some stunt I could pull that would have the equal effect. [Laughter]

When Frank was giving me the introduction, he said it was just a year ago, and this young, charismatic Governor was out—I thought to myself, what happened to that guy? [Laughter] You know, people ask me all the time whether there's anything really different about being President, and is it different from being a Governor or some other job? And it really is.

One of the things is that people walk around on eggshells all the time, and they're always trying to protect you, even from things that aren't necessarily in need of protecting. The other day I came down from the residence floor at the White House to the first floor. And I didn't know this, but my wife was having a meeting with some women there, about 30 of them, talking about health care, and the meeting just let out as I got off on the floor. I was going around the corner to another little room, and all of a sudden I found myself in the middle of 30 people whom I had never met before. I literally just walked out into their midst. So I shook hands with them, said hello. It was quite pleasant. And this young aide who was working there, a man who's a full-time employee of the White House, said, "Oh, Mr. President, I'm so sorry that I let you out in the middle of all those people." And I looked at him, and I said, "That's all right, young man, I used to be one." [Laughter] That's the way I sort of feel sometimes.

I want to tell you how very proud I am to be here today with you, all of you who offer our fellow countrymen and women the information, the analysis, the range of opinions that they need to make decisions about their future.

I know that there's always a healthy tension between the people in public service and the press. And when I have bad days I re-

member that another President who had a few bad days with the press himself, Thomas Jefferson, said that if he had to choose between having a Government without newspapers or newspapers without a Government, that he would not hesitate for a moment to prefer the latter. I think that was on one of the days when he got a good press. [*Laughter*]

I want to say, in all seriousness, that I've had the opportunity over the last several years to read a fairly large number of newspapers from around the country. As all of you know, I believe very strongly that over the last 10 to 12 years the political system, which includes both parties, in many important ways failed our people. And oftentimes, it was newspapers of our country who continued to put the human concerns of people back at the center stage of public debate, reporting on the stagnation of living standards that created so much anxiety for the middle class and so much despair for the poor.

I think, in particular, of the incredible series run by the Philadelphia Inquirer, called "America: What Went Wrong?", and the detail in which that series documented what happened to the middle class in America as most families worked harder for lower wages and had more insecurity in the fundamentals of their lives.

But many other papers, perhaps all of them all across the country, issued various reports on other problems that were neglected for too long: how we went from a \$1 trillion to a \$4 trillion deficit in national debt in 12 years; how most of the gains, the economic gains of the 1980's went to people in the top 3 to 4 percent of income brackets; how we came to spend over 33 percent more than any other country in the world on health care and still had over 35 million people without any health insurance and millions of others at risk of losing it at a moment's notice; the problems we had in our school systems, our welfare systems; the problems we had with drug abuse and crime; the problems we have in the rising tide of people in what may well be for them a permanent underclass, most of them young women and their little children or young, single, unemployed and uneducated men.

Editorial writers warned us about organized interest having too much dominance over public policy, and the slogans and the smears and the sound bites having too much dominance over public debate and election decisions. Newspaper after newspaper reported on the profound disaffection of so many of our people from the political process itself. When the political system seemed brain-dead and deadlocked, with so many people locked into yesterday's rhetoric and yesterday's policies, many in the newspapers helped to give the American people not only the information they need but the sense that with that information, something profound could be done to change the course of our Nation's history.

I don't think there's any question that the size of the turnout last November, the nature of the turnout, with so many people from traditionally underrepresented groups in the electorate, including so many millions of young people, indicated that the American people wanted some fundamental change in the way our Government does the people's business. And fortunately for me, I was given the opportunity to try to lead that change.

Now that we have taken office and had almost 100 days to work at it, I know that you are about the business of playing your roles, not as a cheering section for our administration but as a conscience for the Nation, measuring the deeds against the words, reminding us still, always, no matter what happens in Washington, of the hurts and the hopes and the capacities of the people who do the voting and who challenge us now to live up to the promise of America.

For those who serve in Government and for those who watch Government up close in Washington, it's all too easy to concentrate on the daily events and the inside stories, to worry about who's up or down or in or out, who won or who lost the moment's battle; too easy to forget about the real people whose real lives will be changed for better or worse by what we do or do not do: the unemployed people, the people who are afraid of losing their health insurance, the teenagers who wonder if they'll have a chance to work this summer, the families who feel less safe on their streets when we

don't provide enough law enforcement officials, and on and on.

We can't forget, amidst all the gamesmanship of American political life which is a high form of entertainment, that there are real people with real stories, and they are what all of our efforts are ultimately about.

Every day, I try to devote some time to looking past the deadlines, to look ahead of the headlines, to look beyond the beltway, to go beyond the false choices and the failed policies and philosophies that still grip so much of the debate that I must confront every day, to go beyond the politics of abandonment or the politics of entitlement, to think about how we can all be in this together. No more every person for himself or herself, and no more something for nothing.

I am doing my best to offer every American an opportunity to succeed and to challenge every American to give something back to our country. Everyone who is willing to work hard and play by the rules ought to have a chance to be a part of this American community, and I think we all know that that is not the case today.

In the first 96 days of this administration, I think we have begun to fundamentally change the direction taken by the Government over the past decade, to go beyond trickle-down and tax-and-spend to a new approach to our deficit and to Government's role that reduces the deficit and increases investment in our future with an economic plan that reduces the deficit by over \$500 billion in the next 5 years, has led to a 20-year low in mortgage rates, which the business writers say this year alone, if we can keep the interest rates down, will result in refinancings which will put over \$100 billion back into this economy; an economic plan that includes an attempt to avoid the inevitable conflict between the environment and the economy by finding ways to create jobs with responsible environmental policy; an economic plan which tries to deal seriously with the enormous problems occasioned by the dramatic reductions in the defense budget and the impact that's had on high-tech, high-wage employment in the United States.

And I might add that tomorrow here in Boston we're going to have the first of five national conferences on that subject here to

try to work in partnership with the private sector, to use the fact that the cold war is over and the defense budget is going down to find new ways for these people to work, to bring their talents and their knowledge and their enormous experience to bear.

We've tried to go, in the trade debate, beyond the old debate between free trade and protectionism to a new policy rooted in the notion that we ought to expand trade to grow our economy and to grow the economy of our trading partners. That is driving us as we seek to conclude a new agreement on the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trades, as we seek to conclude a treaty with Mexico and Canada to integrate our economies over the long run, and as we seek to redefine our relationship with Japan in the economic area.

We seek to go beyond inertia and ideology to experimentation and initiative and a reliance on more individual responsibility in social policy, with initiatives in welfare reform and national service and national health care and community policing. We seek to go beyond politics as usual to political reform with a serious effort to reduce the influence of lobbying in our political process, to reform the campaign finance system, to reduce the Federal bureaucracy and increase the amount of your tax dollars that can be invested in ways that directly promote the health and welfare and economic well-being of the American people. We seek to go beyond the divisive rhetoric of family values to an administration that values families, one that gives everybody a chance to be part of America's families. That's what the Family and Medical Leave Act was all about. That's what repealing the ban on fetal tissue research so that we could save the lives of children afflicted by diabetes and other dangerous diseases was all about. That's what the effort to immunize all of our children is all about.

There is such an incredible gulf in this country between what we say and what we do, it is an awful burden to bear if you're a serious American citizen. You hear all this talk about how much we care about our children. Well, I'll tell you something. We make over half the vaccines in the world in this country, and we have the third worst immunization record in the Western Hemisphere.

And everybody goes around piously talking about how all this Government stimulus program I had was a bunch of pork barrel. It wouldn't have been pork barrel for the kids we would have immunized against preventable childhood diseases.

In the aftermath of the cold war, we are trying to fashion a new world rooted in democracy and human rights and economic reform, a world in which the United States will lead but in which we will continue to work with our allies. There is, as we speak now, a Russian election which has just concluded. We don't know how it came out. I can tell you that I know the polls show that the American people think that the President of the United States should not have spent time or their money on Russia. But I respectfully disagree.

I grew up in an age when the biggest threat to my future as a little child was whether there would be a nuclear war between the United States and what was then the Soviet Union. Historic events in the former Soviet Union and in Eastern Europe have given democracy new hope. The START I and START II treaties, if they can both be implemented by all the nuclear powers, give our children new hope. We cannot afford to withdraw from the struggle of promoting democracy, human rights, market reforms, and an end to imperialism in that part of the world. And whatever happens today, we must engage the Russian people on those fronts, because my children and our country's future, all of our futures and all of our children's, are at stake there.

We have other interests as well, in Bosnia. The United States in the last 96 days has tried to increase the efforts of the West to bring about a settlement. We led the effort to put a no-fly zone and to enforce it through the United Nations. We started airlifts of supplies to people who were isolated. We got two of the three parties to sign on to the Vance-Owen peace process. We have dramatically increased the enforcement of tougher sanctions. It has not been enough, and now we are considering what our other options are. I say, frankly, it is the most difficult foreign policy problem this country faces, but we have to try to bring an end to the practice of ethnic cleansing and to

bring a beginning of peaceful resolution of the conflict there.

We told the American people, I and the people who work with me, that we would restore real, not just rhetorical, responsibility to the actions of Government. That's what our education initiative to write the national education goals into the law of this country, to have real standards, is all about. That's what the initiatives that the HUD Secretary, Henry Cisneros, is undertaking to have certain strict rules of conduct for people who live in public housing is all about. That's what the initiatives we're taking to help people move from welfare to work is all about.

We told the American people we would try to accomplish what no other administration has ever been called up to do in the history of this country before. We would try to reduce this massive Federal deficit and increase investments in areas critical to our future, because, funny enough, in the last 12 years we exploded the deficit and reduced our investment in areas critical to our future. We have to do that because we have to free this economy of the burden of debt we are shouldering. And we have to invest because while we're doing it, we have to realize that we're in a competitive global economy, and we still have technologies and workers and students that have to have the benefit of appropriate investments in order to be fully competitive.

Doing these things will expand job opportunities and incomes for middle-class people and help others to move into the middle class, something that has all but stopped in the last couple of years.

When I submitted to the Congress the core elements of my budget plan, designed to change these policies of debt and disinvestment and decline in return for thrift and investment and growth, the Congress adopted that budget plan in record time, the first time in 17 years a budget resolution has passed Congress on time.

When people say to me, "Well, what did you do in your first 100 days?" I say, "What did the other guys do in their first 100 days?" The United States Congress deserves a lot of credit for taking all the heat after all these years of antitax rhetoric, "No such thing as a good tax. Taxes are terrible." They adopted

a budget with 200 specific budget cuts, over and above the last budget adopted under the previous administration, and some tax increases, 70 percent of which fall on people with incomes above \$100,000, over 50 percent of which fall on people with incomes above \$200,000; with an energy tax that the middle class will have to help pay that is good for conservation and good for the environment and good for the long-term direction this country needs to go in. Budget cuts and revenue increases.

We are already seeing the fruits of that. Because of interest rates going down, the deficit this year is going to be less than we thought it was going to be. This is something of very significant importance. The financial markets have clearly responded. Stock prices are at all-time highs, and many key interest rates, including home mortgage rates, are at 20-year lows. As I said, this means \$100 billion more in money coming from refinancing of homes and businesses, credit card rates, and automobile interest rates going directly into the economy over the next year. And that's not my figure. Those are the figures of the business writers who have examined the circumstance that exists. These refinancing possibilities mean that farmers and small-business people and homeowners are going to have a better deal in their ordinary lives, but that money will then flow back to more productive purposes in the economy.

Along with the \$514 billion deficit reduction program, we're also trying to confront the long-term economic problems of this country with a lifelong learning package that includes an attempt to devise apprenticeship opportunities of 2 years after high school for every American who does not go on to college, with initiatives to build a 21st-century infrastructure that focuses on technology as well as physical infrastructure, with efforts to revitalize our community and to strengthen our economy.

As I said, I think to get this done—and we're coming back now to try to pass the details of the budget—we will have to begin to see the world new, not as tax-and-spend, not as trickle-down, but as invest-and-grow. We'll have to think of Government not as the sole problem or the sole savior but as a partner with the private sector in trying

to work our way out of the problems that we have. We'll have to think about new approaches based on old values like work and faith and family and opportunity, responsibility and community. Our success will ultimately be measured not by how many programs we've passed but by whether we improve the lives of our fellow Americans, not simply by what we do for people but by what we help people to do for themselves.

We start, I think as we must, with honoring and rewarding work. Just 17 days into this administration, we made family and medical leave the law of the land after 8 years of gridlock and delay and two vetoes. Hard-working men and women now can know that if they have to take a little time off for a genuine family problem, they can do it without losing their jobs.

Again I say, I heard all the clamor about what a terrible bill this was. And I looked around the world, and a hundred and some nations have found a way to give family leave that we just couldn't find it in our heart, our minds, a way to provide before we got around to doing it. It's time Americans put their actions where their rhetoric is, and that's what this administration is trying to do.

Forty-four days into the administration we were called upon to extend unemployment compensation to hundreds of thousands of jobless men and women, something now Congress will do as a matter of course without regard to party. Everybody is willing to pay people to remain unemployed. But this time we changed the law so that we spend a small portion of that money to offer the unemployed new opportunities for job training and counseling to try to move them back to work more quickly, based on a New Jersey experiment which shows clearly that we can do that if we don't just pay people to stay out of work but we take some of that money to get them back to work.

That's why we are trying to dramatically increase the earned-income tax credit to working poor people. It is a solemn commitment to those who work, who care for our sick or tend to our children or do our most difficult and tiring jobs, that we're going to do our best to enshrine in our tax law and in our country's life the principle that if you work for a living 40 hours a week and you've

got children in the house, you should not live in poverty. I think that is an important principle and one that's worth fighting for.

That is why I tried for several weeks to pass an emergency jobs program through the Congress which, I want to point out, I did not campaign on in the campaign of 1992. I ran a fiscally responsible campaign. I did not offer to do anything that we did not pay for in the moment we did it. And this jobs program was a responsible approach based on the fact that the American economy was not producing new jobs, even though we were allegedly into the second year of a recovery.

We're supposed to be in the 24th month of a recovery, according to the economic statistics. But jobs have increased by only eight-tenths of one percent. And private sector jobs have not increased in that period. If we were following the trend of typical past recoveries, jobs would have grown by more than 7 percent. We are still 3.5 million jobs behind the rate generated in a normal economic recovery. And we have reclaimed only one-half the jobs we lost in the last recession. This past week, jobless claims went up yet again. At a time in which 16 million men and women are out of work or looking for full-time work with part-time jobs, I'm fighting to give them a chance to earn a paycheck, to do useful work, to support their families, to contribute to their communities.

Now, the stimulus package that I offered, the jobs plan, would not have revolutionized the economy. It was a \$16 billion program in a \$6 trillion economy. The purpose of it was to do just exactly what it would have done. It would have lowered the unemployment rate by half a percent. And it might have sparked a new round of job creation in other sectors of the economy.

I decided to do it, even though it was not part of my campaign, because the economy was sluggish and because as I looked around the rest of the world, I discovered that all of the advanced industrialized countries were having great difficulty creating jobs even in recovery. If you go back and look at what happened to Europe in the last decade, they had two different economic recoveries that have produced virtually no new jobs in many of those countries. And all I wanted to do

was to try to find a way to deal with what I think is the number one problem. If everybody in this country who wanted a job had one, we wouldn't have half the other problems we've got. And I think every one of you, without regard to party or philosophy, would agree on that.

There were two objections raised to the program. Some said, "Well, you ought to pay for it all right now." Well, we had a 5-year deficit reduction plan that reduces the deficit by \$514 billion. And Congress pays for things all the time over a multiyear period, number one. Number two, because of unpredicted reductions in defense, if we'd spent every penny I recommended, we'd still be under the spending levels approved by the Congress for this year.

The other thing people said, well, was, "There's a lot of pork in this plan." Well, I don't know how you define that. I think if you put 700,000 kids to work this summer, particularly under our plan, which for the first time said that the at-risk kids had to do some education as well as take jobs—we tried to take more pork out and put more standards in—it would be a good thing. I think if you open these immunization centers this summer, I think if you had more kids in summer Head Start and you paid people to work in that, I think if you rehired 20,000 of these police officers who were laid off because of tough economic times and made the streets safer, I think if we accelerated funding under the highway program, which has always had enormous support from the other party as well as from the Democrats, and I think if we gave some more money to the Mayors and the Governors of this country for job purposes, that would be a good thing. I don't think it would be a lot of pork.

It was amazing to me to listen to some of the debate about the community development program. I was a Governor for 12 years. I used that program. You might quarrel with some of the things we did, but usually what we did was good for creating jobs in my State. And the Republican Party had always supported community development block grants before. They thought Mayors and Governors were smart enough to make the decisions. I wanted to give money to Governor Weld, a Republican Governor of Massachusetts—

I thought he had enough sense to figure out how to best spend the money here for the Massachusetts economy—or the Republican Mayor of York, Pennsylvania, or the Republican Mayor from Indiana who's the head of the Republican Mayors Association. You know, all we did was change the occupants of the White House. We didn't change the party or the personality of the Governors and the Mayors. I don't know what happened that made that program such a bad idea all of a sudden. It was a good idea.

And again, I tell you that it is not nearly as important as the big picture budget that has already passed. But it is symbolic of the idea battle that we have to fight. We have to be prepared to think anew. Now, if no western country is creating jobs, even in the midst of economic recovery, it is not readily apparent that the \$100 billion we're going to put back into the economy with lower interest rates are going to lead to a whole lot of new jobs. They may. It depends on how the money is invested.

That's the big deal, the fact that we've got interest rates down, we've passed the budget resolution, it's going. All I wanted to do was to strike a little match to that and see if we couldn't put several hundred thousand people back to work in useful places and see if that would help the economy to get going on the job machine. I think, still think, it was a worthwhile effort. And I'd a lot rather get beat trying to put people to work than get beat fighting putting people to work.

Let me also tell you that I regret the partisan tone of the rhetoric of the last several days, because a lot of the things that I support have a lot of support among Republicans. I'm for the line-item veto. There are Democrats that are against it and Republicans that are for it. I'm for the crime bill. I hope we can pass it with bipartisan support, the Brady bill and more police on the street. I'm for cuts in the budget that a lot of people in my own party won't support. But a lot of them voted for cuts in the budget, because they thought it was a responsible way to go overall.

There are lots of things that I think we need to do that I hope we can get bipartisan support, toughening the child support system, having a national service program that

will give every young person in this country a chance to borrow the money to go to college and pay it back, either as a percentage of their income at tax time so they can't beat the bill or by working it off and giving something to their country. These are things that ought to have bipartisan support. We cannot solve the problems of this country if every last issue that comes up, just because the President recommends it, becomes a source of a filibuster in the Senate or, frankly, attracts only members of my own party. I don't want that. I want us to debate these ideas anew, to look at them anew, to take our blinders off. And I'm not going to be right about everything I recommend, but at least I want us to be up there all working together fighting for change.

Let me say one thing in particular about the work that two very important people in my administration are doing, the Vice President and the First Lady. I met with a lot of you before I came out here, and several of you said, "Well, I generally support what you're doing, but you ought to bring that deficit down more." And I will say to you what I say to everybody: Send me a list of the things you want cut, because we found 200 things that we were cutting that weren't cut in the previous budget, and we're not done yet.

But I want you to know what this Government is like now. In my judgment, if you want further meaningful cuts, you have to do two things: You have to look at the whole way the Federal Government is organized, because there is a limit to how much you can get just out of cutting defense unless you deal with the way it is organized, like procurement and issues like that, structural things. And that's what the Vice President is involved in, this whole initiative to reinvent the Government. We've got hundreds of gifted people from all over America coming to work with us in Washington now, reexamining every last Government program, every last Government organization, committed to thinking about it anew.

This fall, when we come out with our program, we're going to ask the American people to think about the role of the Federal Government: What it should do; how it should be organized. And it's going to be a

very challenging report. I hope all of you will read it and give it a lot of publicity. And on the tough things that we recommend, in terms of changes, I hope we can get some good support without regard to party, because a lot of the things that we have to do now require us to rethink how this whole thing is organized.

We've already cut 14 percent in administrative costs, 25 percent of the personnel in the White House, and a lot of other things that we can do symbolically and substantively that will save billions of dollars. But to get more, we're going to have to literally rethink the whole Government.

The second point I want to make is, you can do all that, and unless we address this health care crisis, the Government's deficit cannot be erased. Under every scenario we saw, from every political source—that is, the Republicans and the Democrats agreed, the bipartisan Congressional Budget Office agreed, everybody agreed—no matter how much we cut the deficit, we could bring it down for 5 years. But after that, it would start going right back up again because of the breathtaking increase in health care cost.

The estimates are now that over a 5-year period, Federal spending for Medicare and Medicaid alone will go up by 67 percent in 5 years. Taking away the defense cuts, taking away the interest savings, taking away the cuts in other Government programs, taking away the cuts in farm support programs, taking away, you name it, anything you want cut, you're just transferring the money to health care and not new health care, more money for the same health care. So that this is not only an incredibly compelling human issue—how do you give coverage to those who don't have it? How do you give courage to those who want to change jobs but can't because they had somebody in their family sick, and the preexisting condition keeps them from getting any health insurance? But how do you restore sanity to the Nation's budget? And by the way, how do you restore health to big chunks of our economy, a lot of our biggest and best companies striving to be more competitive. We say, "We desperately want you to start investing in America and stop investing so much of your money to create jobs somewhere else." And they say, "Give me

a break. I'm spending 19 percent of payroll on health care."

This country is spending 15 percent of its income on health care. No other country is up to 10 percent. Only Canada is over 9 percent. So when people say—you'll hear it all—they'll say, oh, they're dealing with health care again, there they go again; it's all taxes and terrible and everything. You figure out what you're paying right now. Every one of you figure out what you're paying for health care, in taxes, premiums, uncompensated care that gets shifted on to your health insurance bills.

And so I say to you, we have got to face some other big fundamental issues. Not just this budget but how the Government is organized, what it delivers, whether it needs to deliver what it does, whether it needs to stop doing some things altogether. And then, what are we going to do about health care? We cannot go on ignoring the fundamental problems. If you've got it, it's still the best health care system in the world.

There are a lot of things about it that are wonderful. I want the delivery system to stay in private hands. I want people to still be able to pick their doctor. I want the best things about this health care system to stay just as it is. But you cannot look at it as long and hard as we have without concluding that we are spending a dime on the dollar on unnecessary paperwork and bureaucratic and regulatory expenses.

People say to me all the time, "You've got to do something about doctors' fees." Let me tell you just one little interest number. In 1980, the average doctor, working in a clinic, took home 75 percent of the money that came into the clinic. By 1990, that doctor was taking home 52 percent of the money coming into the clinic. Where did the rest of it go? Mostly to paper, to regulation, mostly from the proliferation of insurance policies, but some from what the Government did.

We can do better. We must. And we're going to bust a gut trying in this administration. We're going to do our best.

The last thing I want to say about this is, I ask for your scrutiny and your understanding as we get into the difficult business of political reform. I intend to ask the Congress

to pass a tough campaign finance reform law. I intend to ask the Congress to adopt some restrictions on lobbying and some disclosure requirements that are not there now. We had the toughest ethics rules any President ever imposed on his appointee that prevent people from leaving my administration and going to work anytime in the near future to make money as lobbyists in the areas in which they worked for us.

These things are important. It may never be possible to be perfect, but it is important that we take these things on and that the voters of this country understand what is at stake as these matters begin to be debated.

And finally let me say—I think it's important to talk about today—I'm doing my best to restore a sense of real community in this country. As I said right when I came to you last year, we'd just seen Los Angeles racked by riots, and we were all talking about how we had to learn to live together without regard to race or income or region. I want to reiterate what I said to you a year ago: We don't have a person to waste in this country, and we're wasting them by the bucketful. We're letting people go, this way, that way, and the other way. And that's one of the reasons that I have said that we have to fight for a society that is not at all permissive but that is tolerant.

Today in Washington, many Americans came to demonstrate against discrimination based on their sexual orientation. A lot of people think that I did a terrible political thing—and I know I paid a terrible political price—for saying that I thought the time had come to end the categorical ban on gays and lesbians serving in our military service and that they should not be subject to other discrimination in governmental employment.

Let me tell you what I think. This is not about embracing anybody's lifestyle. This is a question of whether if somebody is willing to live by the strict code of military conduct, if somebody is willing to die for their country, should they have the right to do it? I think the answer is yes, if somebody is willing.

But in a larger sense, I want to say to you that I think the only way our country can make it is if we can find somehow strength out of our diversity, even with people with whom we profoundly disagree, as long as we

can agree on how we're going to treat each other and how we're going to conduct ourselves in public forums. That is the real issue.

It's very ironic to me to see that the traditional attacks on the position I've taken on this issue have come from conservatives saying that I am a dangerous liberal. I took on two issues like this as Governor of Arkansas, and I was attacked by liberals for what I did, and I want to tell you what they were.

One was the leadership role I took in crafting a bill that permitted people to educate their children at home, consistent with their religious beliefs and their educational convictions, as long as the kids could take and pass a test every year. And people say, "Oh, that's a terrible thing. All those kids should be required to be in a school. How can you do that?" And I said, "Because at least these people have coherent families and that's still the most important unit of our society, and people ought to have a chance to try other things. And it wouldn't do the schools any harm to have a little competition, unsubsidized by the taxpayers, just letting people do it."

Two, when the fundamentalist religious groups in my State were confronting a legal issue that swept the country in the mid-eighties, a bunch of them came to me and said, "We do not mind having our child care centers subject to the same standards that everybody else is subject to. But it is a violation of our belief to have to get a State certificate to operate what we think is a ministry of our church. Don't make us do that." I don't know if you remember this, but in one or two States there were preachers that actually wound up going to jail over this issue, the certification of child care centers.

We sat down and worked out a law that permitted those churches to operate their child care centers without a certificate from the State as long as they were willing to be subject to investigation for health and fire safety, and as long as they agreed to be in substantial compliance with the rules and regulations that those who were certified observed. And people said, "How can you do that?" You know how many complaints we've had coming out of that, to the best of my knowledge? Zero. Not a one. Why? Because they were good people, and they were willing

to play by the rules, and they wanted to have their religious convictions, and they wanted to stick up for their minister, and they desperately love the children that were in their charge. And we protected the public interest.

But all the criticism I got was from the left, not the right. This doesn't have anything to do with left or right. This is about whether we are going to live in a country free of unnecessary discrimination. You are free to discriminate in your judgments about any of us, how we look, how we behave, what we are. Make your judgments. But if we are willing to live together according to certain rules of conduct, we should be able to do so. That is the issue for America. And it has ever been unpopular at certain critical junctures. But just remember this: A whole lot of people came to this country because they wanted a good letting alone. And that's what we ought to be able to do today.

That's it. I've already talked longer than I meant to. I'll still stay and answer the questions for the allotted time. We've got to change the direction of the country. We've got to compete in a new world we don't understand all the dimensions of. But we ought to be guided by three simple things: How can we create opportunity; how can we require all of us to behave more responsibly; and how can we build a stronger American community. And I don't believe that the answer necessarily has a partisan tinge. And I hope we can begin tomorrow the business of going forward with what this country urgently needs to do.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:14 p.m. in the Grand Ballroom at the Marriott Copley Place Hotel.

Question-and-Answer Session With the Newspaper Association of America in Boston

April 25, 1993

Bosnia

Q. I'm director of the School of Journalism at Northeastern University here in Boston. I apologize for not being an actual member of NAA, but I guess I'm here as your guest.

Mr. President, you did refer to Bosnia. And I must say, as we look at that situation, it is horrifying; it is so reminiscent of what happened in Europe in the Second World War. I wonder if you would be able to explain to us why the West, which is possessed of imagination and technology, can stand idly by while these horrible things go on?

The President. Suppose you tell me what you think we ought to do, what the end of it will be?

Q. Well, you know, I could speculate, but I didn't come here to foist my ideas on other people. I'd be interested to hear what you have to say. It's obviously an immensely difficult question, because it could drag you into areas that you don't want to go, a Balkan war, an expanded—but let me quit. I'd like to hear your—

The President. All right. Let me just tell you that I think that the European countries, that are much closer to this than we, would like very much to find a way to put an end to the practice and to the principle of ethnic cleansing. They are very concerned about it, just as the United States has been.

The question is not simply how to stop the Serbs from cleansing certain areas of Bosnia of all the Muslim inhabitants and killing and raping along the way, but also what the end of it is from a military and political point of view. That is, there is much more ethnic coherence, as you know, in the other republics of what used to be Yugoslavia. So the question is, what can we do that will actually achieve the objectives you seek? And secondly, who's going to live where, and how are they going to live when it's over?

Then there are all the tactical questions about whether, in fact, it could be done. Remember, in the Second War, Hitler sent tens of thousands of soldiers to that area and never was successful in subduing it, and they had people on the ground.

That does not mean that there is not anything else that we can do. I'm not prepared to announce my policy now. I can tell you I've asked myself the question you asked me a thousand times. I have spent immense amounts of time on this, talking to General Powell; talking to Reg Bartholomew, our

Special Ambassador to the area; talking to the Secretaries of State and Defense and the Ambassador to the United Nations; and soliciting opinions from others in Congress and elsewhere. And I assure you that we are going to do everything we think we can to achieve those two objectives. One is to stand up against and stop the practice of ethnic cleansing. The second is to try to find some way for the people who live in Bosnia and Herzegovina to live in peace. But I have to tell you, the more you look at it, it is by far the most difficult foreign policy problem we face, both in terms of the larger political issues and in the purely tactical questions to resolve it. I wish I could be more specific now, but if I were, I would be announcing a policy that has not been finalized.

Telecommunications

Q. My question has to do with telecommunications. Newspapers and others who wish to offer electronic information services can do so now only by using the local exchange monopolies of the telephone companies, principally the Bell operating companies. The telephone companies would like to be deregulated, and they would like to use those monopolies to offer those same services themselves. Would your administration support the establishment of competition for local exchange services before granting deregulation?

The President. I thought you'd never ask. [Laughter] I hesitate to give you the honest answer. The honest answer is, I'm not sure I still understand it well enough to give you an answer. We have a technology working group in the White House; there are about five issues that we're looking at, of which this is one. And no decision has been made yet, and I wish I could give you a more intelligent answer. I can tell you this: You have certainly rung my bell, and I will get on top of it next week. [Laughter] I didn't mean that, ring my bell. Hey, what can I tell you; it was a long week. [Laughter]

President Yeltsin of Russia

Q. You mentioned the Russian election ongoing today. Could you tell us whether or not you have had any contact within the past 24 hours with President Yeltsin and, if so,

what advice or counsel you may have given him?

The President. I haven't had any contact with him in the last 24 hours. And I haven't done it because he had no business talking to me because I couldn't vote for him. [Laughter] He needed to be out there stirring around. I also was, frankly, quite sensitive to the delicate tightrope that Yeltsin walks in our relationships together. That is, apparently the Russian people believe that it is, on balance, a good thing that we met in Canada and that we came forward with the aid package and that all of us in the G-7 are trying to help them in ways that will be more real than the last aid package. And that's not a criticism of the previous administration so much as a criticism of the process which made Russia ineligible for a lot of the things that we said, the nations of the world said they were going to do for them. All that's been a plus.

On the other hand, the enemies of reform and the enemies of Yeltsin just beat him to death with me all the time. I don't know if you saw in one of the newspapers—maybe it was the Wall Street Journal that had a quote in the last day or two in Yeltsin's campaign where one of his enemies were saying: The only person for him is Bill Clinton. [Laughter] And so I have on purpose not had any personal and direct contact with him in the last few days because I didn't want to hurt him in the election. But I can tell you this: I think he's going to do pretty well today, and we need to be in this for the long term with him. And I intend to call him as soon as it's appropriate, when we have some sense of which way things are going.

Education Financing

Q. I'm a student at University of Massachusetts at Amherst. And I, with a lot of other students, because of tuition fees, may not be coming back next year. And I was wondering how your administration is going to try and step in and help public state colleges, help us students afford it, basically.

The President. We're trying to do two things. First of all, one of the things I attempted to do in the jobs program which didn't have anything to do with jobs—it was sort of like unemployment—was to deal with

the problem left on the table last year, which is to replenish the Pell grant program, to try to get it ginned up.

And then, what I want to do with this national service proposal—it really has two components that are distinct but related. The one would make available, to all Americans who go to college, income-contingent loan repayment. Now, that's a brain-breaker of a phrase; I'm trying to think of some clever way to say that that makes common sense. But the idea is that any young American, or not-so-young American would be able to borrow the money to finance a college education and then pay the loan back, not based on so much just on how much you borrowed but also on a percentage of your income so that it would be affordable for everyone. And we could do it for a lower cost because we are proposing to cut the administrative costs of the program and to make people pay the loan back with some connection to the tax system so you can't beat the loan. An enormous number of college loans now are not repaid at all, putting enormous burdens on those who do repay. If we set this up the way we're trying to, that would mean no one would ever have to fear a loan again, because you would not start to repay it until you were employed. And your ability to repay would be secured by having the formula for repayment tied to your own salary. So if you made less, even though you borrowed more, you'd just pay at a smaller rate over a longer period of time.

The second thing we want to do is to give more young people like you the chance to actually earn your way through college through rendering service to your country, either before you go to college, after you get out, or while you're going, under the national service program. And if we could do those two things, I think we could lift the crushing burden of college costs off millions of young people. And we're going to introduce the national service program to do that on the 100th day of this administration. And I hope you will support it.

Media Credibility

Q. Mr. President, I'm a student at Boston College and a communications major. I'd like to ask you, do you think the news media

today is too concerned with gossip and sensationalism?

The President. I don't know that I'm the one to answer that. [Laughter] I think the answer to that is, you can't generalize about it. I must say, I am stunned from time to time at the stuff I read in the papers now about things in the National Government that are just purely based on gossip. I mean, I think you can get a rumor into print a little too easy now, I do, and even in the news magazines, some of them, although there seem to be different standards for different ones. But I wouldn't generalize. I think, by and large, there are still quite high standards of proof and fact that most people in journalism require before they go with stories. But I am kind of amazed, actually, of the stuff—most of it doesn't affect me at all—but the things that will get into print if you just say it is a rumor or "it's alleged that" or "somebody said that." I think there's a little too much of that in some places, but it would be unfair to generalize about it. And by and large, it occurs either in the tabloids, which are a different class, or in journalistic media that basically live and breathe with political gossip, where there's more pressure to do that all the time.

Congressional Budget Cuts

Q. Mr. President, I think many of us were very pleased to hear you say today that Vice President Gore has been put in charge of looking at ways of streamlining the budget. Of course, we all know that the Congress is in charge of the financial spending of the United States. Will there be any looking by Vice President Gore of the way Congress has increased its spending many times over the last few decades?

The President. Well, let me say two things. Number one, I think Congress has made a commendable beginning in cutting back its staff expenses, too. They've, I think, adopted a 12 percent cut, absolute cut target over the next couple of years, not quite as much as the administration has but not insignificant. And they deserve credit for that. Secondly, there's been a lot of pressure, because of the publicity that's been brought to bear on Congress, to scale down on some of the committee and subcommittee work for

select committees that were recently abolished by the Congress. And let me just say this: There are a lot of Members of Congress who believe that they're on too many committees or subcommittees. There are a lot of them who don't feel they can do their best work. I don't think it is for the executive branch to tell the legislative branch how it should reorganize itself. We have a separation of powers clause in the Constitution which I think has a good purpose.

I think the best thing you could do, since you need to know—there are a lot of people in the Congress who are honestly asking these questions—the best thing you can do is to give the issues that you care about, all of you, in terms of congressional organization, a high level of visibility and make your suggestions about what should be done and go at them directly, because they are not reform averse. Now, I can tell you that the freshman legislators are certainly not. But believe me, I've got plenty to do reorganizing the executive branch, and there's more money there. And I think it would be inappropriate for me to tell them how to do it. I think it's better for you to tell them how to do it.

Stimulus Package

Q. Mr. President, some recent indicators suggest that the economic recovery may be slowing down. If that continues, will you take another run at a stimulus package? And what would have to be different about it this time?

The President. Well, I don't know. As I said in my press conference a couple of days ago, we've sat down at the White House, and we've tried to really reexamine how this whole thing was handled and what I could have done differently, how I could have done a better job in presenting this, because I'm sure that there were some mistakes made on our side, too, in terms of how it was done.

I can tell you this: There are people in the Republican Party, for example, in the Senate, who are generally sympathetic to this sort of thing—people who voted for these kind of supplemental appropriations over 25 times in the last 12 years—who voted against it because they basically thought that even if it wasn't increasing the deficit, this was another way certainly to reduce it—if you don't

spend the money—and that we were in a recovery.

I think what I'm going to do is to just examine, with people who care about this, what we did that wasn't right the last time and how we could do it better and what our options are. Because as I said, I live in a State with perhaps the toughest balanced budget law in the country. I'm appalled by the size of the deficit. I can't stand it. I wouldn't spend a nickel to see the cow jump over the Moon if I didn't think it needed to be done. So the reason I asked for this package was because I saw it as a part of a big overall deficit reduction package that would maybe jumpstart this economy right now. And we're just going to have to revisit it.

Let me say that we had a huge increase in productivity in the fourth quarter, as all of you who follow this know, I know, and that's wonderful work. It means output per worker is escalating dramatically. The difference is that in the past when productivity went way up, it normally meant a reinvestment in the business which would lead to more people being hired.

Today—and I'll bet you a lot of newspapers can identify with this, I'll bet you a lot of you have gone through this—today, when you have an increase in productivity, you may turn around and put it right back into what produced the productivity, which is new technology which may reduce the pressure to hire people. And small businesses, which hired almost all the new workers net in the eighties, have slowed down not only because they too are reaping the gains of technology and productivity but also because of the incredible extra costs it takes to hire a new worker in terms of health care costs, Social Security, workers' comp, and all the rest of it.

So, I know I haven't answered your question, but the short answer is this: If the economy slows down, we'll go back and try something different. And I don't know what it is, but we'll keep trying things that are different. Because keep in mind, one of the reasons the economy may be slowing down is that the economic growth rate is so low in Europe and that our friends in Japan are having a tough time. That's another reason: I thought if we could get this small stimulus out now,

that the Japanese job stimulus package which is much larger would begin to bite about 6 or 7 months from now and that we might have some movement in Europe because the Germans continue to lower their interest rates, hoping, I think, trying to make an effort to stave off this slow growth. So what we do will depend on what happens in Europe, what happens in Japan, and what my options are if it becomes clear that the economy's really slowing down.

Moderator. Mr. President, unfortunately I'm going to have to interrupt and say we have time for just one more question. And there's a smile back on that lady's face. And I'd like all of you please to stay in place when the President is finished. You're going to do more than that, did you say?

The President. We ought to let those two young people back there——

Moderator. All right, fine. We're going to——

The President. You qualify——

Moderator. There's no question you're in charge here, so——[laughter]

The President. Nearly everybody looks young to me these days. Go ahead.

Campaign Promises

Q. Over the past week or so, I've been taking a poll for my radio class about your favorability with your first 100 days in office. It seems that you've started to fall out of grace with a lot of college students. And they were citing that you didn't keep the campaign promises. What would you say to boost the morale of our generation?

The President. Well, give me an example. One thing I'd say, you can't expect instant results. It took 12 years to get in the situation that I found when I took office. One of the things I would say to college students is you need to have a realistic expectation about what kind of time it takes to get anything done.

The second thing I would say is that what I promised college students was a national service bill, and we're introducing it on the 100th day. We're doing it. And we're also going to release a report which shows how many of my campaign commitments that I have kept. To the best of my knowledge, the only one I haven't been able to keep was

to give some tax relief to the middle class because the deficit, the week after the election, was announced at being \$50 billion bigger than I thought it was. And I can't responsibly offer to cut anybody's taxes when the deficit is going up instead of down. That's not right, and I can't do it. But the budget that was adopted by the Congress, in general, is completely consistent with my campaign commitments. I've got a national service program going, a health care program going. We're changing the way the Government operates—all the things that I promised to do. I have imposed tougher ethics guidelines than anybody else has ever imposed. I'm going to offer a campaign finance reform and a lobby restriction bill. Everything I talked about in the campaign is being done.

Now, if people thought that I'd be President and 90 days later every campaign commitment I made would be written into the law and everybody's life would be changed, I think that's just not realistic. You have to have a realistic feeling about how much time it takes to change and how long it takes to have an impact on it.

Another thing is, when you're not in a campaign, when you have to stay there and go to work, you're at the—and this is not a criticism of you, this is a fact—you are at the mercy of the press coverage. The defeat of the \$16 billion stimulus package got 50 times the press coverage of the passage of the multitrillion-dollar budget resolution. Why? Because we won, and we won in record time and in short order. Again, I'm not being critical; that's just the way this whole deal works. And if somebody stands up and criticizes me, that's good news. And I welcome that.

But I'm just telling you, I think that if you look at what's actually been done in this 100-day period and compare it to what has previously been done within 100 days, in a long time, I think you'll have a very difficult time saying that the actual accomplishments were, number one, not consistent with my campaign commitments—they were—and, number two, that they're not quite considerable. So what I've got to do is a better job communicating to the students you represent what has been done and what we're going to do and how much I need their help to fight for

it. That's why you get a 4-year term, not a 3-month term.

Q. I don't know if I should be up here or not, but just to make sure that you're not guilty of age discrimination—[laughter]—I guess that I was ahead of the gentleman behind me. I have a question for you about what you refer to as gridlock in Congress, because it seemed to me that for the first time Congress did say no to some very good programs because of the fact that they would add to the deficit, and that this was in fact breaking a previous gridlock which existed when Congress, when they had good programs, would simply say, well, we've got to add to the deficit. And you campaigned on reducing the deficit. And why couldn't you—admittedly, that you have some very good programs in the stimulus bill—why couldn't you, say, cut tobacco subsidies or any of a number of other programs that weren't as necessary as what's in your stimulus package?

The President. I will answer that. First of all, I had 200 such cuts, 200 that were not adopted by the previous administration or the previous Congress in the previous budget, 200. I did not ask that stimulus bill to be voted on until the Congress had adopted the budget resolution committing itself to more than \$500 billion of deficit reduction in the next 5 years, more than \$500 billion, including this \$16 billion. It was paid for by those budget cuts.

Secondly, as I said, even if it hadn't been paid for, all of the spending was under the spending limits that Congress had already adopted. It was paid for. And you know, I must tell you that I find it—I will say one more time, a majority of the Republican Senators voted under Presidents Reagan and Bush—not the Democrats, the Republicans—28 times for over \$100 billion of exactly the same kind of spending, usually for foreign aid purposes, without blinking an eye. And so, do I think that it was a mistake that they didn't vote for it? I do.

Now, if I had just come up and said, how about adding \$16 billion to the deficit this year, they should have voted against that. But I didn't ask them to vote on it until we had adopted a budget resolution in the Congress that reduced the deficit \$514 billion over the next 5 years, including the \$16 billion. I did

not ask them to vote to spend until they had voted to cut. Now, I concede that I didn't do a great job of painting that picture, but that is a fact. And you ought to write those fellows and ask them how they'd feel about just the suggestion that you made. Tell them to come up with that program. We'll see what we can do with it.

Q. Thank you.

Law Enforcement

Q. Thank you for waiting, Mr. President. I'm a student journalist from Boston University. And you've mentioned so far, in a couple different contexts, that you're interested in putting more police officers on the streets. I was also concerned and wondering that, in the same notion, are you willing to create some kind of, I don't know—do you have a task force now that would look into community relations between police officers and the public? Because I'm from a city and a neighborhood where some people might feel safer with more police in the streets, but a lot of people would actually be terrified with more police in the streets.

The President. Well, I accept that. The answer to your question is no, I haven't thought about that. Maybe I should think about it, but I haven't. But let me answer you in this way: When I have talked about putting more police officers on the street, I've always talked about it with two things in mind. First of all, keep in mind that in the last 30 years, there has been a dramatic worsening in the ratio of police to crime. Thirty-five years ago there were approximately three policemen for every serious crime, every felony reported. Now there are three felonies for every police officer. That puts enormous pressure on those police officers. I'm not justifying abuse. I'm just talking about the kinds of pressures in the day-to-day work of the cops on the beat, out there on the front line living with all this. So I believe that if you had more police officers who were well-trained, you would have a reduction in tensions.

But secondly and more importantly, I believe it's important to go to community based policing, where you have the same group of police officers, unless they're misbehaving, working in the communities month in and

month out, year in and year out, establishing relationships with people in the communities so that you dramatically reduce the likelihood of abuse or fear, because people know each other. They've got people walking the beats. They know the first names of the police officers. They see them as friends. In the cities where I have seen that happen, I have seen not only a decline in crime but also an increase in mutual trust and understanding between folks in a community and folks in the uniforms.

So I think you've made a very good point. It's not just important that we have more police officers, but the structure of policing, in my judgment, has to be more rooted in particular communities. And I think if we did that, the crime rate would go down significantly. And by the way, there is a lot of evidence, probably in a lot of the cities in which you live here, that that would in fact occur.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:56 p.m. at the Marriott Copley Place Hotel.

Statement to Participants in the Gay Rights March

April 25, 1993

Welcome to Washington, DC, your Nation's Capital.

During my campaign and since my election, I have said that America does not have a person to waste. Today I want you to know that I am still committed to that principle.

I stand with you in the struggle for equality for all Americans, including gay men and lesbians. In this great country, founded on the principle that all people are created equal, we must learn to put aside what divides us and focus on what we share. We all want the chance to excel in our work. We all want to be safe in our communities. We all want the support and acceptance of our friends and families.

Last November, the American people sent a message to make Government more accountable to all its citizens, regardless of race, class, gender, disability, or sexual orientation. I am proud of the strides we are making in that direction.

The Pentagon has stopped asking recruits about their sexual orientation, and I have asked the Secretary of Defense to determine how to implement an Executive order lifting the ban on gays and lesbians in the military by July 15.

My 1994 budget increases funding for AIDS research, and my economic plan will fully fund the Ryan White Act. Soon I will announce a new AIDS coordinator to implement the recommendations of the AIDS Commission reports.

I met 9 days ago with leaders of the gay and lesbian community in the Oval Office at the White House. I am told that this meeting marks the first time in history that the President of the United States has held such a meeting. In addition, members of my staff have been and will continue to be in regular communication with the gay and lesbian community.

I still believe every American who works hard and plays by the rules ought to be a part of the national community. Let us work together to make this vision real.

Thank you.

NOTE: Representative Nancy Pelosi read the statement to march participants assembled on the Mall.

Executive Order 12846—Additional Measures With Respect to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro)

April 25, 1993

By the authority vested in me as President by the Constitution and the laws of the United States of America, including the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*), the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*), section 5 of the United Nations Participation Act of 1945, as amended (22 U.S.C. 287c), and section 301 of title 3, United States Code, in view of United Nations Security Council Resolution No. 757 of May 30, 1992, No. 787 of November 16, 1992, and No. 820 of April

17, 1993, and in order to take additional steps with respect to the actions and policies of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) and the national emergency described and declared in Executive Order No. 12808 and expanded in Executive Order No. 12810 and No. 12831,

I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, hereby order:

Section 1. Notwithstanding the existence of any rights or obligations conferred or imposed by any international agreement or any contract entered into or any license or permit granted before the effective date of this order, except to the extent provided in regulations, orders, directives, or licenses which may hereafter be issued pursuant to this order:

(a) All property and interests in property of all commercial, industrial, or public utility undertakings or entities organized or located in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro), including, without limitation, the property and interests in property of entities (wherever organized or located) owned or controlled by such undertakings or entities, that are in the United States, or that hereafter come within the United States, or that are or hereafter come within the possession or control of United States persons, including their overseas branches, are hereby blocked;

(b) All expenses incident to the blocking and maintenance of property blocked under Executive Order Nos. 12808, 12810, 12831 or this order shall be charged to the owners or operators of such property, which expenses shall not be met from blocked funds. Such property may also be sold or liquidated and the proceeds placed in a blocked interest-bearing account in the name of the owner;

(c) All vessels, freight vehicles, rolling stock, aircraft and cargo that are within or hereafter come within the United States and are not subject to blocking under Executive Order Nos. 12808, 12810, 12831 or this order, but which are suspected of a violation of United Nations Security Council Resolution Nos. 713, 757, 787 or 820, shall be detained pending investigation and, upon a determination by the Secretary of the Treasury that they have been in violation of any of

these resolutions, shall be blocked. Such blocked conveyances and cargo may also be sold or liquidated and the proceeds placed in a blocked interest-bearing account in the name of the owner;

(d) No vessel registered in the United States or owned or controlled by United States persons, other than a United States naval vessel, may enter the territorial waters of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro); and

(e) Any dealing by a United States person relating to the importation from, exportation to, or transshipment through the United Nations Protected Areas in the Republic of Croatia and those areas of the Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina under the control of Bosnian Serb forces, or activity of any kind that promotes or is intended to promote such dealing, is prohibited.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of the Treasury, in consultation with the Secretary of State, is hereby authorized to take such actions, including the promulgation of rules and regulations, and to employ all powers granted to the President by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act and the United Nations Participation Act as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this order. The Secretary of the Treasury may redelegate the authority set forth in this order to other officers and agencies of the Federal Government, all agencies of which are hereby directed to take all appropriate measures within their authority to carry out the provisions of this order, including suspension or termination of licenses or other authorizations in effect as of the date of this order.

Sec. 3. Nothing in this order shall apply to activities related to the United Nations Protection Force, the International Conference on the Former Yugoslavia, and the European Community Monitor Mission.

Sec. 4. The definitions contained in section 5 of Executive Order No. 12810 apply to the terms used in this order.

Sec. 5. Nothing contained in this order shall create any right or benefit, substantive or procedural, enforceable by any party against the United States, its agencies or instrumentalities, its officers or employees, or any other person.

Sec. 6. This order shall not affect the provisions of licenses and authorizations issued pursuant to Executive Order Nos. 12808, 12810, 12831 and in force on the effective date of this order, except as such licenses or authorization may hereafter be terminated, modified or suspended by the issuing federal agency.

Sec. 7. (a) This order shall take effect at 12:01 a.m. Eastern Daylight Time, April 26, 1993.

(b) This order shall be transmitted to the Congress and published in the *Federal Register*.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
April 25, 1993.

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 9:55 a.m., April 26, 1993]

NOTE: This Executive order was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on April 26, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on April 27.

**Message to the Congress on
Additional Measures With Respect to
the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia
(Serbia and Montenegro)**

April 26, 1993

To the Congress of the United States:

On June 1, 1992, pursuant to section 204(b) of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1703(b)) and section 301 of the National Emergencies Act (50 U.S.C. 1631), President Bush reported to the Congress by letters to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House, dated May 30, 1992, that he had exercised his statutory authority to issue Executive Order No. 12808 of May 30, 1992, declaring a national emergency and blocking "Yugoslav Government" property and property of the Governments of Serbia and Montenegro.

On June 5, 1992, pursuant to the above authorities as well as section 1114 of the Federal Aviation Act (49 U.S.C. App. 1514), and section 5 of the United Nations Participation Act (22 U.S.C. 287c), the President reported

to the Congress by letters to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House that he had exercised his statutory authority to issue Executive Order No. 12810 of June 5, 1992, blocking property of and prohibiting transactions with the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro). This latter action was taken to ensure that the economic measures taken by the United States with respect to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) conform to U.N. Security Council Resolution No. 757 (May 30, 1992).

On January 19, 1993, pursuant to the above authorities, President Bush reported to the Congress by letters to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House that he had exercised his statutory authority to issue Executive Order No. 12831 of January 15, 1993, to impose additional economic measures with respect to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro) to conform to U.N. Security Council Resolution No. 787 (November 16, 1992). Those additional measures prohibited transactions related to transshipments through the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro), as well as transactions related to vessels owned or controlled by persons or entities in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro).

On April 17, 1993, the U.N. Security Council adopted Resolution No. 820, calling on the Bosnian Serbs to accept the Vance-Owen peace plan for Bosnia-Herzegovina and, if they failed to do so by April 26, calling on member states to take additional measures to tighten the embargo against the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro). Effective 12:01 a.m. EDT on April 26, 1993, I have taken additional steps pursuant to the above statutory authorities to enhance the implementation of this international embargo and to conform to U.N. Security Council Resolution No. 820 (April 17, 1993).

The order that I signed on April 25, 1993: —blocks all property of businesses organized or located in the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia or Montenegro), including the property of entities owned or controlled by them, wherever organized or located, if that property is in

- or later comes within the United States or the possession or control of U.S. persons, including their overseas branches;
- charges to the owners or operators of property blocked under that order or Executive Order No. 12808, 12810, or 12831 all expenses incident to the blocking and maintenance of such property, requires that such expenses be satisfied from sources other than blocked funds, and permits such property to be sold and the proceeds (after payment of expenses) placed in a blocked account;
- orders (1) the detention, pending investigation, of all nonblocked vessels, aircraft, freight vehicles, rolling stock, and cargo within the United States that are suspected of violating U.N. Security Council Resolution No. 713, 757, 787, or 820, and (2) the blocking of such conveyances or cargo if a violation is determined to have been committed, and permits the sale of such blocked conveyances or cargo and the placing of the net proceeds into a blocked account;
- prohibits any vessel registered in the United States, or owned or controlled by U.S. persons, other than a United States naval vessel, from entering the territorial waters of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (Serbia and Montenegro); and
- prohibits U.S. persons from engaging in any dealings relating to the shipment of goods to, from, or through United Nations Protected Areas in the Republic of Croatia and areas in the Republic of Bosnia-Herzegovina under the control of Bosnian Serb forces.

The order that I signed on April 25, 1993, authorizes the Secretary of the Treasury in consultation with the Secretary of State to take such actions, and to employ all powers granted to me by the International Emergency Economic Powers Act and the United Nations Participation Act, as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of that order, including the issuance of licenses authorizing transactions otherwise prohibited. The sanctions imposed in the order apply notwithstanding any preexisting contracts, international agreements, licenses or authorizations. However, licenses or authorizations

previously issued pursuant to Executive Order No. 12808, 12810, or 12831 are not invalidated by the order unless they are terminated, suspended or modified by action of the issuing federal agency.

The declaration of the national emergency made by Executive Order No. 12808 and the controls imposed under Executive Orders No. 12810 and 12831, and any other provisions of those orders not modified by or inconsistent with the April 25, 1993, order, remain in full force and are unaffected by that order.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
April 26, 1993.

Remarks to the University of Arkansas Champion Track Team

April 26, 1993

Thank you very much. Please be seated. As all of you know, as an ardent sports fan I have happily followed the practice of previous Presidents in welcoming to the White House various national championship teams in college and professional athletics. But this is a special honor for me today to welcome to the White House an historic team, the NCAA indoor track champions for the 10th year in a row, the Razorbacks from my home State and home university, the University of Arkansas.

I also want to extend a special welcome to my friend, who this year became the most successful coach in the history of intercollegiate athletics, John McDonnell. I'm sorry it's raining here today. I wanted the team to have a chance to try out the new jogging track on the South Lawn. *[Laughter]*

I also want to say that this team has done some amazing things. I would like to just say that it's really worth contemplating how it happened and what it means for the efforts they made and the kinds of things that ought to be done in intercollegiate athletics and at the athletic events and teams of younger people, too. This is the first time that any team in any sport has ever won 10 national titles in a row. The Razorbacks, under coach

McDonnell, have now won 18 national championships in cross-country and indoor and outdoor track, which makes him the winningest coach in history.

Just think of it, though, John: If you had come here last year they might have called you the failed coach from a small southern State. [Laughter] Before the coach came to the University of Arkansas we really had no history of track success there; football got all the attention. He left his native County Mayo in the west of Ireland and made his way to Arkansas, and he's been bringing our track teams the Irish luck ever since.

I am told now that every one of our school's indoor and outdoor track records is held by one of John's recruits. Over the last three decades, since he came to the university in the seventies, he's coached 10 Olympians in 4 games, including Mike Conley who won the gold in the triple jump last year in Barcelona. He's fostered 19 individual national champions in 39 different events.

I actually think that I might hire him to become my training coach. [Laughter] I read in Runner's World that I didn't have enough stamina, and they told me that I should run up the steps of the Capitol. And so, I've started running up the steps of the Capitol every morning, which is exhausting to the Secret Service but as yet is having no effect on the United States Congress. [Laughter] I thought about this all, and I've decided that I should instead prepare for a marathon and leave track and field to the University of Arkansas.

I want to say, too, that this team has twice won the triple crown, the combined championships in indoor, outdoor, and cross-country. And they're trying for a third triple crown at the NCAA outdoor competition in New Orleans in June, and I want to wish them well.

Again, I want to say that I am especially proud to welcome this team here, because I know something about the coach and his values and the way these things have been done over the years. You don't win this many times over this many years unless you're concerned about the character and well-being of your athletes, as well as just about whether you win one particular meet or another. And so I want to say to all of you, it's a great

source of pride and pleasure for me to present to the United States this track team and this fine coach.

Coach, come up here and say a word.

[At this point, the President was presented with a gift.]

John, I have something I want to give you in honor of your historic achievement. I want to give you this Presidential commendation for doing something no one ever did before, one for you and one for the team.

I also want to point out that in your honor the First Lady made a rare appearance at one of my press conferences wearing Irish green.

At the end of the press conference, I'm going to shake hands with the team and take some pictures and say hello to all of you from home, but I do have to make a brief announcement about the election in Russia and then perhaps answer a couple of questions.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:10 p.m. in the East Room at the White House.

Remarks on the Election in Russia and an Exchange With Reporters

April 26, 1993

The President. Not very long ago, perhaps about, oh, an hour ago now, I had a conversation with President Yeltsin. I called to congratulate him on his outstanding victory in the election and to reassure him that the United States continues to support him as the elected leader of Russia and continues to look forward to our partnership in working to reduce the threat of nuclear weapons, to increase trade and commerce, and to promote democracy. This is a very, very good day, not only for the people of Russia but for the people of the United States and all the people of the world.

I will say again I know that there have been times in the last 3 months when many Americans, troubled with their own economic difficulties, have asked why their President would be so involved in trying to support the process of democracy in Russia. And I want to say again why that is so. They are a huge

country with vast natural resources, with enormous opportunities for Americans to create jobs and to earn income and to reap the benefits of trade. They still have thousands of nuclear weapons which we must proceed to reduce and to dismantle so that the world will be a safer place and so that we will no longer have to spend our investment dollars, that we need so desperately to rebuild our own economy, on maintaining a state of extreme readiness and large numbers of warheads positioned against Russia. And they are a great country that can be a symbol of democracy in a very troubled part of the world if democracy can stay alive there. They can prove that you can make three dramatic changes at once as they try to move from a Communist system to a democracy, from a controlled economy to a market economy, and to a nation state away from being an imperial power with occupying armies.

This is a victory that belongs to the Russian people and to the courage of Boris Yeltsin, but I am very glad that the United States supported steadfastly the process of democracy in Russia. I was glad to have a chance to talk to President Yeltsin. Needless to say, he was in a very good humor when I talked to him, and he had a good sense of humor. And he offered the United States a great Russian bear hug for their support for democracy in Russia and, actually, in the other republics of the former Soviet Union as well.

So, it was a very good conversation. But I do want to say that this is a good day, not just for the people of Russia but for the people of the United States as well.

Aid to Russia

Q. Mr. President, will this election result help you sell your aid package to Congress?

The President. I would hope so. I think it will validate the policy of the United States, which I might say has been by and large a completely bipartisan one. I want to say a special word of appreciation to all the living former Presidents who supported the position I took here: President Carter and President Reagan and President Ford, President Nixon and President Bush, all of them. They made it easier for all of us to maintain a united American front. And I want to say a special word of thanks to all the leaders in

Congress on both sides of the aisle who supported this policy.

I do believe that we have to think of this as a long-term effort. We have to be in this for the long run. But I think it will be immensely beneficial to the United States.

Russian Election

Q. Mr. President, were you surprised by the results on all four questions?

The President. Well, I sort of thought he would win on all four. I thought there might be some difference, and as you know, there was a difference in the vote between the referendum on Yeltsin himself and his policies. But you would expect that in tough times. We've had a lot of Western leaders reelected in the last 3 or 4 years in the midst of economic difficulties where the people got reelected and there was still debate about their policy, because people are having a tough time, and people in Russia are having a very tough time. I think the reaffirmation of his policies really is a tribute to the farsightedness of the Russian people. I think in the end what happened was they decided that as difficult as it is, that that is the only path they could take. And I think, again, it's a real tribute to his courage and to their common sense and ability to see the future. And it's very tough to do when you're going through what they're going through: terrible inflation, unemployment, all those dislocating problems. It is a real tribute to their maturity and to their courage and foresight.

Stimulus Package

Q. Mr. President, will you now break down your jobs stimulus bill and offer them one at a time on the meritorious projects?

The President. Sarah [Sarah McClendon, McClendon News Service], I thought they were all meritorious. I have not made a decision about what to do. I want to consult with the Members of Congress. I think it is imperative that we make some decisions along that line. Certainly the Russian issue, I think if it's going to be seriously addressed by Congress, has to be done in the context of what our first obligations are to the American people and their interests. And so we'll be talking about that. And I expect to make a decision in the fairly near future on that.

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, do you now have a course of action that you're free to take by virtue of this result in Russia that you might have been inhibited in taking before, perhaps on Bosnia or perhaps on some other issue, perhaps on Russia itself?

The President. Well, what you say may be true in the sense that had there been a reversal there, the position of the Russian Government might have become much more intransigent. It is now, I think, clear that the United States and our allies need to move forward with a stronger policy in Bosnia, and I will be announcing the course that I hope we can take in the next several days. I want to do some serious consultations with the Congress and others, and I will be doing that in the next few days.

But now I think the time had come to focus on that problem and what it means for the United States and has for the rest of the world, as well as for the people that are suffering there.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 3:20 p.m. in the East Room at the White House.

Nomination for Ambassador to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development

April 26, 1993

The President announced today that he intends to nominate David Aaron to be Ambassador to the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development.

"David Aaron is an experienced and accomplished foreign policy hand, who has already been of great service to me as an adviser during my campaign and an emissary in Europe before I was inaugurated," said the President. "I am confident he will serve our country capably at OECD."

NOTE: A biography of the nominee was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary.

Remarks to the National Realtors Association

April 27, 1993

The President. Thank you very much. And thank you, president Bill. [Laughter] I'm glad to be on your coattails today. [Laughter]

I'm glad to see all of you in a good humor, enthusiastic and, I hope, feeling very good about your country. I'm glad to have you here today in our Nation's Capital. I saw some people from my home State out there in the crowd as I wandered around. I see them back there.

You know, in politics, you don't have a lot of job security. And therefore, I've been a good customer for several realtors over the years. [Laughter] Even though I now live in America's finest public housing—[laughter]—I actually was a customer on several occasions.

I want to thank you at the outset for the support this organization has given to the economic program I have put before the Congress and to our efforts to put the American people back to work. I'm proud to be here with people who are on the frontlines of America's real economy, who understand the need for fundamental change in the way we promote growth and increase profits and generate jobs.

I believe we have begun to make those fundamental changes, but I think we can only see the job through if we have the help of you and millions of people like you who live in the economy beyond the beltway, where people are not guaranteed jobs and have an uncertain future.

I had an interesting encounter here just a couple of days ago. I was out on my morning run, and as is often the case, I just saw some people along the Mall out there. I was running up toward the Capitol the end of last week, and this young man asked if he could jog along with me. And he was visiting the Nation's Capital, and I asked him what he did for a living. And he said, "I'm in the real estate business in Texas." And he said, "I'm just telling you," he said, "I'm out there seeing it." He said, "It's just amazing how hard people work just to keep their heads above the water. And we need jobs and edu-

cation in this country. We need to do something to make these cities safer. And we've got to turn these things around." And he said, "I just want you to know that." He said, "I have more awareness of it than I ever did since I've been in the real estate business, because I really see people and how they have to live and the struggles they endure." And I understand that about the work that you do. And I thank you for the support you've given to the efforts that we've made.

In the first 3 months of this administration, we have fundamentally changed the direction taken by our National Government over the previous decade. I've tried to overcome inertia, ideology, and indifference. I've tried to reach out a hand of partnership and to restore energy and experimentation to this Government.

Everybody knows we're living in a new and uncharted time. There is a global economy coming together in ways that are good and bad, opening all kinds of new opportunities for us but also affecting us. When there is a recession in Japan and recession in Germany and a recession in the rest of Europe, it affects the United States.

We are trying to figure out now how we should chart our course in the future. But we do know some things about what works and what doesn't and what has always worked in the American free enterprise system. The changes we have to make won't be easy. It hasn't been so far. It's not going to be easy in the future. But we have to do these things. One of the things that we know is the worst thing we can do in many cases is to stay on the path that we were on.

I submitted to the Congress a blueprint of a budget plan designed to change the policies of debt and disinvestment and decline, to bring a new spirit of investment and growth and thrift to the Government. Both Houses of Congress agreed to the budget plan in record time, a plan that will reduce the national deficit by over \$500 billion in the next 5 years.

These votes are important because they're votes of confidence, and they illustrate that this town has finally gotten serious about cutting the deficit. That's one of the reasons we saw a big upturn in the stock market at the same time interest rates were hitting record

lows. As you know better than anyone, these things can bring enormous long-term benefits to the economy.

Just look at this chart that I brought with me. I only brought one, but I wanted to show this one. My staff, they started letting me take charts around again. You know, I used to carry them all, and I used to get criticized for putting people to sleep with numbers and statistics and everything. So I quit for a while. But I just couldn't stand it anymore, I had to bring one. *[Laughter]*

This chart shows what has happened to 30 year fixed rate mortgages with a 20-percent downpayment since the election. Look at this. Six months prior to the election the average rate was 8.2 percent. Right after the election we announced that we were going to seriously work to bring this deficit down, and we began intense meetings in Little Rock with people who were part of our administration and people from around the country. We had the national economic summit. From election day to February 17th, the day on which I presented the plan, the average rate was 8.1 percent. Since February 17th the average rate has been 7.5 percent. Today the rate is the lowest it's been since August of 1972, the lowest in over 20 years.

These reductions have prompted, as you well know, a wave of refinancing which will put over \$100 billion back into this economy in a 12 month period if we can keep these rates down. That is a huge boost to the economy.

Businesses will pay less to borrow. That will help them to make new investments and create new jobs. The Federal Government is already saving billions of dollars as we roll over the debt at each auction. Our national deficit this year in this budget is going to be much lower than it was thought to be because of the lower interest rates. And of course, as you well know, this means lower home mortgages for citizens, lower car payments, less expensive credit card payments at the end of each month, strengthened by our subsidiary efforts to attack the credit crunch, which are now getting underway in earnest, and working with community banks all across the country. This is liberating billions of dollars in capital. It means that farmers and small-businesspeople and others can

look forward to a better future if we can keep the trend going. It means that there will be new confidence in the economy, and that can be a catalyst for economic growth. It means progress.

The question we now have to ask is: Will we continue this progress? How can we turn back? For in the next few days, Congress will begin to consider the legislation to turn the budget resolution, which adopted the form of budget cuts and revenue increases and deficit reduction and new investments, into very specific, specific budget items. And now the time has come to reinvigorate and re-energize our efforts to make sure that the budget steps that have been taken are going to be followed through on.

The process is kind of complicated, and it's known in the Congress as reconciliation. But it means that they have to reconcile all of the thousands and thousands and thousands of specific decisions on tax cuts, tax increases, spending decreases, spending increases into a final bill which reflects the budget resolution which was adopted several weeks ago and which you all supported. So it is very important that the final resolution be really a reconciliation; that is, that it is consistent with that first budget resolution that the Congress courageously adopted.

It's important to realize what's at stake. We're supposed to be in the 24th month of an economic recovery. I bet if we took a poll among you, it would be hard to get a majority for that proposition. But the economists say, based on aggregate economic figures, we're in the 24th month of a recovery. Still, we have fewer private sector jobs than we did in 1990; 16 million men and women are looking for full-time jobs. This past week, jobless claims went up again. Housing starts and sales of existing homes are still on the decline. That's why I've been fighting so hard for some immediate action to get the economy moving and to create new jobs.

I want to stop here, just sort of create a parenthesis and say, when you see all these struggles going back and forth in Washington, and it may be reported to you that the President wins this battle and loses that battle, or somebody's up and somebody's down, it's very important for you to try to clear away the political smokescreen and ask yourself

what is really at stake here. We are waging a great contest of ideas. And I ran for President in the hope that I could change the ideas that both parties had brought to the national debate. And there are, not surprisingly, people here who not only have different political agendas but who honestly have different ideas.

What I hope to do in the days and weeks and months ahead is to say, look, I don't have all the answers, but if we're going to fight, let's don't fight over this or that political advantage or some speculative impact on some future election. Let us wage an honest battle of ideas. And then we can find out what's best for the American people.

My belief is, if you look at the last 12 years, our country got in trouble because we did two things at the same time: We dramatically increased the Government's debt, going from \$1 trillion in national debt to \$4 trillion in debt. And believe it or not, we decreased at the same time the Nation's investment in many things that are critical to our future, the National Government's investment in many education and training areas, in non-defense technologies. We weren't keeping up with all of our competitors in the infrastructure that makes communities strong and growing and lifts incomes and opportunities. We weren't keeping up with our competitors. And we were actually spending a much smaller percentage of our budget in 1990 than we had in 1980 or 1975 in many of these critical areas. This had never happened before.

At the same time, because of these policies, because of tax policies, and because of global economic pressures, we saw most middle class people working longer weeks for lower wages than they had been drawing 10, 15 years before.

So it seemed to me what we needed to try to do was to turn both those things around, to try to decrease the Government's deficit and adopt a disciplined plan that would run not just 4 years, but 8 or 10 years, to bring this debt down to zero—the deficit down to zero, so we could turn—[*ap-
plause*—so that we could reduce the percentage of our income that our national debt comprises.

In the early seventies the national debt got down to about, oh, 27 percent of annual income. It's now up to \$4 trillion, which is about two-thirds of annual income. On the other hand, I want to emphasize, if you wanted to abolish it overnight, you could do it, but it would collapse the economy.

Again, this is a battle of ideas. Idea number one: Should we reduce the deficit? Everybody will say yes.

Audience member. Yes.

The President. Sure. [Laughter] Sure. Then the question is: How fast, how much, and on what kind of a timeframe? My objective has been to try to bring it down substantially but not so dramatically as to cause another recession in a difficult economic time but to do it with an 8 year plan in mind, not just 4, that will actually do away with it. So we can bring it down to zero so we can begin to stabilize the debt, because even as you reduce the deficit—that's what you're running in red ink every year—the debt will grow.

But if we do this for 8 years, we can bring it down to zero. We can then reduce dramatically the percentage of our income that the national debt represents, and we can strengthen the long-term health of the economy. And then we can have some money to invest in other things that we need to invest it in.

Second thing: Can we afford to put all of our investment programs on hold for 4 or 8 years and spend no new money on anything? Major idea: I would argue the answer to that is, no. Because we know that in the world in which we're living, in the global economy, what we earn depends on what we can learn; that new technologies are the source of most new jobs that pay high wages and have enormous spin-off effects on people like realtors. You've got a growing economy in your area; you're going to do better. If you have a shrinking economy in your area, you won't do as well.

Thirdly, I would argue, you cannot afford to stop investing, because we have cut the defense budget so much in areas that cost jobs, not just base closings, the obvious things, but even more importantly, as anybody from California or Connecticut or Massachusetts can tell you, in areas related to

research and development and production of weapons, which provided very high-wage jobs in manufacturing and in research.

So for all those reasons I don't think you can just put all your investments on hold. I think we've got to empower the American people to be able to compete in the global economy. So while we bring the deficit down, I would argue we need to have at least modest increases in some areas of investment.

That means, in my view, that you have to have very rigorous spending cuts in other areas, and you have to raise some more money, because we dramatically altered the tax base of the country back in 1981. That's why I presented the program that this organization endorsed.

Now, I welcome people who have different ideas. But I think it's very important to scrutinize them. Some will say, "Well, we can have the same deficit reduction with lower taxes if we have no new investments." That's true. They're right. That is an opposition idea that is absolutely true. But I think we would pay for it. So we could argue about that.

Others will say, "We ought to cut the deficit more, and I hate all taxes." They're not telling you the way it is. If that crowd wins this battle, the deficit will go up, not down. You mark my words.

There are others who say, "I wish they'd leave that health care thing alone." Let me tell you why I don't agree with that. The biggest spending increases in the first part of the last 12-year period were in defense. But defense peaked out in 1986, and it's been going down since. And my fellow Americans, without regard to party, respectfully, there is a limit to how much you can take it down, how fast. We still have responsibilities, and this is still a difficult world with a lot of unpredictable things out there. And we have cut it a lot. I don't mean the rate eventually. It's been cut.

So you might say, "Well, what has happened? If defense has been going down for 5 years, how come this deficit keeps going up?" I'll tell you why. Because in the last 5 years the defense increases have been supplemented by explosive increases in health care costs and in interest payments on the debt.

So we're trying to get the interest payments down by bringing the interest rates down. But we have to address the health care issue. If we don't do anything to add a single new benefit, not anything to add a single new benefit, we'll have a 67-percent increase in outlays for Medicare and Medicaid in the next 5 years, going up at 12 percent a year, assuming an inflation rate in the economy as a whole of about 4 to 5 percent. And, of course, a lot of you who pay health insurance see the same thing in your own premiums.

The United States of America spends 15 percent of its income on health care. No other nation in the world is at 10. Only Canada is over 9. That means when our automotive companies or our airplane manufacturers or our major service sector people go into the global economy, they have spotted their competitors a one-third advantage on health care. And actually, it's worse than that because a lot of people don't pay anything, because they get uncompensated care at emergency rooms. So a lot of our bigger manufacturers actually pay more than 15 percent of their income for health care.

This is a very troubling thing. I don't mean to tell you there are easy answers, but the reason I asked my wife to take on this issue is, I could see that if you want an 8-year plan that brings this debt down to zero, you can never get there without health care reform. You can't get there without health care reform.

Another big idea: If you look at everybody's deficit reduction plan—it doesn't matter what party or what their ideas are—we can cut this budget and we can bring it down for 5 years. If my plan is adopted, the one I put before Congress or some reasonable facsimile of it, it will bring this debt down steeply for 5 years. And then the next year it goes right up again. Why? Because all the cuts we make and all the money we raise will be overcome by health care explosion.

If we don't change the way we're going by the end of this decade, we'll be spending 18 percent of our income on health care. No other country then will be over 10, and we will really be in the soup. Now, that's a big idea. You have to decide whether you agree with that or not, but I believe that. And that

drives what I'm trying to do as your President.

So in summary, what I've tried to do is to put people and their needs first, build a foundation that invests in education and technology and the future economy and gets people out of an economy that is fast going away and has trapped them, to do what businesspeople do for their companies, to put more investments into things that don't work, to try to reduce unnecessary debts and cut out a lot of things, put more investment in things that do work and cut out a lot of things that don't.

In this budget that I have presented to the Congress, there are over 200 specific budget cuts. I do want to restore responsibility in the way your money is spent. And I am appalled at this deficit. I live in a State which is in the bottom five in the percentage of income going to State and local taxes, had a tough balanced budget law, and permitted me to cut spending across the board every month when revenues were below spending. I don't like what's going on. But you cannot fix it overnight. We have to have a disciplined plan that will bring it down without endangering the economic recovery and recognizing the things that we ought to be investing in so we can compete with these other nations for the jobs of tomorrow.

I tried to set an example. We cut the size of the White House staff by 25 percent starting in the next budget year. It's already well below where it was when I took office. We cut across-the-board administrative expenditures of the Federal Government 14 percent over the next 5 years. The Congress has followed suit. They get a lot of criticism, but I will say this: They've followed suit. They've agreed to nearly that big an administrative cut in their staff. We've eliminated a lot of unnecessary perks and privileges. And most important of all, I've asked the Vice President to head up a task force on reinventing Government.

We now have several hundred people from all over this country coming to Washington to help us reexamine the way every last dollar of your tax money is spent. And in September when we come forward with that report and the Vice President's task force reports, I think we'll have a whole new round of

changes in the way your money is spent that will not only save money but will treat taxpayers more like customers and try to make this Government a low-cost, high-quality producers of services for you. And we'll reexamine some things, believe me, that have not been examined in 60 years in the way things are done.

What I want to ask all of you to do is to ask the Members of Congress to help us make this street run two ways. Pennsylvania Avenue has to run two ways. And the dispute I had last week over the stimulus, all the people who disagreed with me were in the other party, in the Republican Party. I'm going to have disputes in the weeks ahead where the people who disagree with me, many of them will be in my own party. But again I say, let us keep this battle a battle of ideas. That's one I think I can win, because I told my ideas to the American people when they voted. But we cannot afford to have one day wasted on mindless maneuvering. We need to argue over the direction of the country.

I'd also like to ask for your help on a specific thing. When I was a Governor I had a line-item veto that I could use to wipe out unnecessary spending. Believe it or not, once I'd used it a little bit, I hardly ever had to use it again. The fact of having it even made a difference in disciplining spending.

I want to point out, it's not just about spending reduction, but it's about the quality of the overall budget. The legislative process is always and in every place a lot like making sausage, as some wise wag once said. That's just the nature of it. A lot of us in our different roles in life have probably contributed to that sausage slicing at some time or another.

It is important that someone who is accountable only to everyone can have some discipline over the process. We now have an opportunity to adopt a law that will provide the President not an identical but a similar means to cut wasteful spending.

This week the House of Representatives is considering, and I urge them to pass, a new law that would give the President the right to reject items in appropriations bills. This proposal is called enhanced rescission. Let me tell you what that means. I hate all these Washington words, don't you? It's kind

of like the line-item veto and only slightly different. Let me tell you what it means. It means that the President is given the power to cut individual spending items, and the rest of the bill can go into effect. Once cut by the President, these items can only be restored unless Congress voted on them separately. Now it wouldn't require a two-thirds majority. It would only require a majority. I think that's probably all we can do under the Constitution of the United States.

But the difference is these items would be out there by themselves, not buried in some big bill. So that when the votes were taken, they would be taken in view of the press and the public, and you could draw your conclusions. And if they were areas where we had, again, a difference of ideas and they believed in the idea and thought it could be defended, then they could vote on it. And you could make your decision. It would give me the chance, and any future President, the chance to try to impose some budget discipline.

In the early seventies the Congress adopted a new budget control act. Before that, Presidents could regularly impound big amounts of spending in the budget, before 20 years ago. And Presidents of both parties regularly did that.

This would, at least, begin to move us in the direction of what I think of as an acceptable compromise. It respects the separation of powers. It ultimately respects the right of the United States Congress to do what the Constitution gives it and not the President the power to do. But it makes both of us more responsible in how your money is spent.

I hope you will ask your Senators and Representatives, without regard to party, to vote for this bill. It is a good idea. And it is a beginning of a reform agenda which I think we should see through.

In the next several days, as we consult with Republicans as well as Democrats, I hope to announce my support of a sweeping bill to reform the system of campaign finance that will reduce the influence of special interest and big money and open up the political process to challengers and also open up the airwaves a little bit so that people will have a chance for honest debate in elections, and

they won't all be turned by expensive 30-second ads.

I hope we'll see the passage in this Congress of a bill requiring much more sweeping disclosure laws for lobbyists. I hope we will see more efforts to get the Federal Government to live within the laws it makes. For example, on Earth Day, the day before Earth Day when I gave my environmental speech, one of the things that I said we were going to do is to have the Federal Government, when we deal with toxic sites within our jurisdiction, start living by the right-to-know laws that were long ago imposed on private employers. I think if we're going to do that to people in the private sector, we ought to live within it.

And I think we have to constantly keep changing the Government. I am very excited about the work being done by the Vice President's Commission on Reinventing Government, and I think you will be, too. There are dramatic changes that can be made in the way we deliver the goods, in ways that will both save money and improve the quality of service.

But let's begin with what I call the Federal version of the line-item veto. Ask your Members of Congress to vote for this enhanced rescission bill. It can't do any harm, and it might do a whole lot of good. And I need it, and you need it.

I just want to say a couple of things that you already know, but they bear repeating. I don't just ask for, in this economic plan, to invest money publicly in things like Head Start and better standards for our schools and apprenticeship programs for young people who don't go to college and the national service program, which we will unveil in its details on Friday, to provide for college education loans for every young person who is willing to pay them back at tax time so they can't beat the bill or by working and paying off the loan by doing something for their country. I also recognize that the main engine of economic growth is you and people like you.

So I believe—and again, this is a battle of ideas. And you can read a lot about this since you're in this town. I believe that, while the '86 Tax Reform Act had some good provisions, the idea of simplifying the rate struc-

ture, lowering the rates, and eliminating some of the individual deductions and trying to simplify, that was basically good. I think the idea that you can have a tax system which has no incentives for investment at a time when you need to increase investment and reduce consumption is wrong. That's my view. That's my view.

Again, this is an honest contest of ideas. I recognize that anytime you fool with the Tax Code, if you're not careful, you just make more money for accountants and lawyers and open loopholes. You've got to be careful with that. So let's recognize there are two sides to every argument on changing the Tax Code. I accept that. But what I have tried to do, based on my experience of a dozen years as a Governor, struggling to get people to invest in my State and grow our economy, and based on untold thousands of conversations over the years with people in the private sector, I tried to present a bill to the Congress that would strike the right balance between not just opening the Tax Code and having it riddled but having significant incentives, especially now, to boost investment.

There are a lot of people who don't think I struck the right balance. But as long as it's a battle of ideas, we can wage that. I just think there is a compelling case to be made that we have always benefited in the history of this country from investment incentives. At a time when there is too little investment and everybody can see that, I think it's something we ought to be sensitive to. So that's something else you'll see as we unfold this battle.

You know how I feel about the real estate issues. I recommended making permanent the low-income housing tax credit. And I recommended stopping the discrimination against people in real estate by changing the passive loss provisions. I feel strongly about it. But I also recommended a change in the alternative minimum tax, which would primarily benefit bigger businesses which invest.

Yes, I asked for the corporate rate on high income corporations to be raised to 36 percent. But I wanted to change those things which would reward investment. I think that's the right decision. I know it's the right direction. We can argue about the details.

I know it's the right direction. So I ask you to help to get that passed.

Let me just say a personal word in closing. I've been very fortunate in my life. I've had a good family. I've had a good education. I've had good jobs. I got to live the American dream. And as I've already said, I've lived in the best public housing in Arkansas and Washington, DC. [Laughter]

I live by some values that I was raised with: the idea that everybody ought to have an opportunity to work hard; the idea that everybody who gets an opportunity has responsibility that goes with it; and the idea that we're all part of a bigger community, and if we have a chance in life, we ought to try to guarantee that same chance to everyone else. That's why I respect the work you do. There's no greater goal for America's families than to be able to live in their own homes and to help their children and their grandchildren and their neighbors to do it.

I respect you, too, because I know that you live with a certain amount of uncertainty in your own life. You live by your wits; you live by your efforts. You don't have a guaranteed income. How well you do depends on how hard and how smart you work, but it also depends on the decisions made by people in this town and by people all around the world that you don't know that impinge on your life and set the parameters in which you operate.

And so I ask you to help join me again in partnership on these issues, to make sure that the struggles that we have in the months ahead are great battles of ideas. It is an exciting time, after all. A lot of good things are going on. The cold war is over. The people of Russia stood up to the old guard and said, "We're going to stay with freedom. We're going to stay with free market economics. We don't want to go back to being an imperial power. We'd like to be part of the world," that you and I take for granted.

A lot of good things going on. Productivity in the private sector in this country increased by the highest rate in 20 years in the last quarter of last year, the American business sector trying to reinvest, trying to compete. A lot of good things going on, but a lot of profound challenges. Let these challenges be

addressed in the spirit of partnership, and let the battles be battles of ideas, not politics.

I do not think we can be down about what's going on. These problems are big problems. They're the problems of our generation. We inherited them, and it's our job to deal with them, not to moan about them. That's our job, to roll up our sleeves and face them and deal with them.

One of the greatest poets that this country ever produced was Carl Sandburg. And I used to save a little quote by Carl Sandburg. I carried it with me for years and years when I was a young man. And it was—I believe I remember it, even though I haven't seen it in 15 years. Sandburg said, "A tough will counts. So does desire. So does a rich, soft wanting. Without rich wanting, nothing arrives. Without effort, nothing arrives." Sandburg said, "I see America not in the setting sun of black night of despair ahead of us. I see America in the crimson light of a rising sun, fresh from the burning, creative hand of God. I see great days ahead, great days possible to men and women of will and vision." I see that, and I think you do, too.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 11:52 a.m. at the Sheraton Washington Hotel. In his remarks, he referred to Bill Chee, president, National Realtors Association.

Remarks Honoring the NCAA Men's and Women's Basketball Champions

April 27, 1993

The President. Good afternoon. I want to apologize to the people who are here from North Carolina and Texas. I have been inside in a meeting with some Members of the United States Congress of both parties, some of whom are also here in the crowd, talking about the situation in Bosnia. And I got away as quickly as I could. I thank all of you for coming here.

It's a great honor for me as an ardent basketball fan to welcome to the White House two proud new national champions, the Tarheels of North Carolina and the Lady Raiders

of Texas Tech, who won the men's and women's NCAA basketball championships.

The Lady Raiders have been stirring things up in West Texas for some time now, with back-to-back Southwest Conference titles, and this year, of course, they brought home Texas Tech's first national championship in any sport. It helps when you have a secret weapon in basketball whose name rhymes with "hoops." No doubt about it, Cheryl Swoopes turned in a tournament performance that was one for the ages. She averaged over 32 points a game and scored 47 points in the final, which is an all-time championship record for men or women in basketball finals. If anybody hasn't figured it out yet, I think women's basketball has arrived.

I'd also like to say that we have to make special mention of the coach of the Lady Raiders, coach Marcia Sharp, who is a four-time Southwest Conference Coach of the Year and who took a wonderful 11-year career at Texas Tech to new heights.

Then there are the Tarheels, one of whom had the grace to remind me that they waxed Arkansas in getting to the Sweet 16. [*Laughter*] There may not be many things you can depend upon in this world, but normally it is when "March Madness" rolls around, you can be sure that Dean Smith's Tarheels will be there at the final bell, with discipline and style as great as any you will ever see. Nineteen consecutive years in the NCAA, 13 trips to the Sweet 16, 9 times to the Final 4, 2 national championships. Even though I have to admit that I didn't pull for them in every game—[*laughter*—I thought they were magnificent, true Carolina Blue champions.

I also want to say a special word of thanks to Eric Montross for not standing on the riser when I walked by. I felt small enough as it was. [*Laughter*] I want to congratulate him and Donald Williams for the three-pointers that they made, and George Lynch for muscling out his opposition on the inside. As a matter of fact, I was thinking of asking George to stay around here for a few days and help me. [*Laughter*]

I want to say again that the thing I like about basketball and the thing I think our country needs more of is that you can't just win with great players; you have to have great teamwork. People have to understand each

other's strengths and weaknesses and learn to work together in a consistent way. These two teams have done it and have done it magnificently, and it's a great honor for me to welcome them to the White House today.

I'd like to now invite the coaches to come up and say a few words.

[*At this point, team members were introduced, and each team presented the President with a basketball.*]

The President. I want to invite all the people to come up here, and we'll all take a few pictures and everything. And I thank all of you for coming. I want to take a few minutes; then I've got to go back to my meeting. Thank you very much.

Congressional Meeting on Bosnia

Q. Have you talked to Biden about your decision, or is this just an information meeting?

The President. No. I have not made a final decision yet, and I am consulting with them and giving them a chance to tell me what they think we should do. And I think that's the appropriate thing to do. I've tried to proceed here, as I did in Russia, with bipartisan support. We're having a very good meeting, and I'm going to take a few minutes to shake hands, then go back to the meeting. We're in the middle of the meeting. I have no results to report, but I am just listening to them.

OMB Director Panetta

Q. What do you think about what Mr. Panetta said today?

Q. Are you taking Leon Panetta to the woodshed, Mr. President?

The President. No, I don't need to take him to the woodshed. I need for him to get his spirits up a little. You know, this is like a basketball game. You see, these guys, there were a lot of times that they were in close games; a lot of times they were in close games, they wound up winning.

I just think he's been working 60 to 70 hours a week, and he got discouraged. I need for him to sort of get his spirits up. He's done a wonderful job for this administration. He's got a lot of credibility, and I think every Member of Congress that's ever worked with Leon Panetta would say he's one of the most

honest, competent people they've ever worked with. He had a bad day yesterday because he got his spirits down. I want to buck him up; I don't want to take him to the woodshed.

Thank you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 4:45 p.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House.

Message to the Congress Reporting on the Continuation of Export Control Regulations

April 27, 1993

To the Congress of the United States:

1. On September 30, 1990, in Executive Order No. 12730, President Bush declared a national emergency under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act ("IEEPA") (50 U.S.C. 1701 *et seq.*) to deal with the threat to the national security and foreign policy of the United States caused by the lapse of the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended (50 U.S.C. App. 2401 *et seq.*), and the system of controls maintained under that Act. In that order, the President continued in effect, to the extent permitted by law, the provisions of the Export Administration Act of 1979, as amended, the Export Administration Regulations (15 C.F.R. 768 *et seq.*), and the delegations of authority set forth in Executive Order No. 12002 of July 7, 1977, Executive Order No. 12214 of May 2, 1980, and Executive Order No. 12131 of May 4, 1979, as amended by Executive Order No. 12551 of February 21, 1986.

2. President Bush issued Executive Order No. 12730 pursuant to the authority vested in him as President by the Constitution and laws of the United States, including IEEPA, the National Emergencies Act (NEA) (50 U.S.C. 1601 *et seq.*), and section 301 of title 3 of the United States Code. At that time, the President also submitted a report to the Congress pursuant to section 204(b) of IEEPA (50 U.S.C. 1703(b)). Section 204 of IEEPA requires follow-up reports, with respect to actions or changes, to be submitted every 6 months. Additionally, section 401(c) of the NEA requires that the President, with-

in 90 days after the end of each 6-month period following a declaration of a national emergency, report to the Congress on the total expenditures directly attributable to that declaration. This report, covering the 6-month period from October 1, 1992, to March 31, 1993, is submitted in compliance with these requirements.

3. Since the issuance of Executive Order No. 12730, the Department of Commerce has continued to administer and enforce the system of export controls, including antiboycott provisions, contained in the Export Administration Regulations. In administering these controls, the Department has acted under a policy of conforming actions under Executive Order No. 12730 to those required under the Export Administration Act, insofar as appropriate.

4. Since the last report to the Congress, there have been several significant developments in the area of export controls:

—United States Government experts have continued their efforts to implement and strengthen export control systems, including pre-license inspections and post-shipment verifications, in the nations of Central Europe and the former Soviet Union—notably Belarus, Bulgaria, the Czech Republic, Hungary, Kazakhstan, Poland, Romania, Russia, the Slovak Republic, and Ukraine, as they continue their progress towards democracy and market economies. We anticipate that these developments will facilitate enhanced trade in high-technology items and other commodities in the region, while helping to prevent unauthorized shipments or uses of such items. A key element of these efforts continues to be the prevention of proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and corresponding technology.

—Working diligently with our Coordinating Committee (COCOM) partners to expand export control cooperation with the newly developing democracies of Central Europe and the former Soviet Union and to streamline multilateral national security controls, we are pleased to report the following important developments:

—In their November 1992 High-Level Meeting, the COCOM partners took action to significantly liberalize export

controls on certain telecommunications exports to the newly independent states (NIS) of the former Soviet Union and other Central European nations, which should facilitate rapid and reliable telecommunications between these nations and the West, as well as modern, cost-effective domestic telecommunications systems. This action was soon thereafter reflected in corresponding amendments to the Export Administration Regulation. (57 F.R. 61259, December 24, 1992.)

- Also in November, at the first High-Level “COCOM Cooperation Forum” (CCF) Meeting, which included the 17 members of COCOM, most of the newly independent states of the former Soviet Union (NIS), and other Central European nations, the United States announced an \$11 million technical assistance package to assist in the elimination of nuclear arms, enhanced nonproliferation efforts, and export control development. The United States, in cooperation with the CCF, hopes to engage these nations in further establishing controls for trade in sensitive goods and technologies, and to provide an impetus for wider access by those countries to controlled items.
- In the first 2 months of 1993, as a result of Bulgarian and Romanian commitments to undertake the establishment of effective export control systems, COCOM agreed to provide favorable consideration treatment for exports of strategic items to those countries. The Commerce Department is amending its regulations to reflect this development.
- We are also continuing our efforts to address the threat to the national security and foreign policy interests of the United States posed by the spread of weapons of mass destruction and missile delivery systems. As such, we continue to work with our major trading partners to strengthen export controls over goods, technology, and other forms of assistance that can contribute to the spread of nuclear, chemical, and biological weapons and missile systems:
- As of December 1992, the Australia Group (AG), a consortium of nations that seeks to prevent the proliferation of chemical and biological weapons (CBW), increased its membership to 24, with the admission of Iceland and Sweden in 1991 and Argentina and Hungary in 1992. In addition, the delegates agreed to increase from 50 to 54 the number of precursor chemicals subject to control and to adopt a common list of controlled biological items. The Commerce Department published a rule implementing these measures. (57 F.R. 60122, December 18, 1992.) As of December 1992, the delegates also agreed to a refined common control list of dual-use biological equipment. The Commerce Department is in the process of publishing a rule reflecting the changes to conform the U.S. list to the AG list.
- The United States was also a key participant in the Chemical Weapons Convention (CWC) negotiations in Geneva, Switzerland. On September 3, 1992, the Conference on Disarmament, which drafted the CWC, forwarded to the United Nations General Assembly a draft CWC, which includes a prohibition on the development, production, acquisition, stockpiling, use, or transfer of chemical weapons, as well as provides for destruction of chemical weapons production facilities and stockpiles. The Convention opened for signing in January of this year. The United States strongly supports these provisions and is working to implement them in harmony with our laws.
- In December 1992, the 27-nation Nuclear Suppliers Group (NSG), in which the United States participates, continued its discussions on nuclear-related dual-use controls. The NSG list is similar to the nuclear referral list currently administered by the Department of Commerce. The Department is working to publish a rule to conform the U.S. list with the NSG list. Also in December 1992, the NSG members agreed to procedures intended to standardize and improve the exchange of information among members.
- At the March plenary session in Canberra, the Missile Technology Control

Regime (MTCR) members welcomed Iceland as the newest partner, bringing the total membership to 23 nations. Argentina and Hungary were also accepted as members, subject to final arrangements agreed to by the MTCR partners. A licensing and enforcement officers conference will be held in June 1993 to provide an information exchange forum for all partners on implementation of the new extended Guidelines, which now cover missiles capable of delivering all weapons of mass destruction. Previously, the regime covered only missiles capable of delivering nuclear weapons. The future of the MTCR is likely to be a main agenda item for the next plenary session to be held in November 1993.

—In the area of supercomputers, in 1991 the United States established a supercomputer safeguard regime with Japan. Since that time both countries have negotiated with European suppliers to expand this regime. Issues discussed at the March 1993 London meeting include the development of a common licensing policy and security safeguards.

—Finally, we continue to enforce export controls vigorously. The export control provisions of the Export Administration Regulations are enforced jointly by the Commerce Department's Office of Export Enforcement and the U.S. Customs Service. Both of these agencies investigate allegations and, where appropriate, refer them for criminal prosecution by the Justice Department. Additionally, the Commerce Department has continued its practice of imposing significant administrative sanctions for violations, including civil penalties and denial of export privileges.

—Commerce's Office of Export Enforcement (OEE) has continued its vital preventive programs such as pre-license checks and post-shipment verifications, export license review, and on-site verification visits by teams of enforcement officers in many countries. The OEE has also continued its outreach to the business community to assist exporters with their compliance programs and to solicit their help in OEE's enforcement effort. The OEE further continued its well-received Business Executive En-

forcement Team (BEET) to enhance interaction between the regulators and the regulated.

—During this 6-month reporting period, OEE has continued its new program—the Strategic and Nonproliferation Enforcement Program (SNEP)—which targets critical enforcement resources on exports to countries of concern in the Middle East and elsewhere.

—Two particularly important enforcement efforts during the past 6 months in which OEE was involved resulted in the arrest and indictment of several individuals, including several foreign nationals. In one case, OEE special agents arrested an Iranian national, Reza Zandian, and an American citizen, Charles Regar, on charges that they conspired and attempted to export a computer to Iran without the required validated license. The computer, valued in excess of \$2 million, was seized by the Commerce Department. The Department of Justice will seek forfeiture of the computer to the United States. In another case, a British citizen doing business in South Africa, David Brownhill, was arrested and charged with attempting to export polygraph and thermal imaging system equipment to South Africa without authorization. Both of these cases are currently pending trial.

—In the last 6 months, the Commerce Department has also continued to enforce the antiboycott law vigorously. The Office of Antiboycott Compliance (OAC) maintains 30 full-time staff positions, and OAC has doubled the level of civil penalties it seeks to impose within the statutory \$10,000 per violation maximum. The total dollar amount of civil penalties imposed in fiscal year 1992 approaches \$2,109,000, the second largest amount in the history of the program. This amount includes a civil penalty of \$444,000 imposed in the first case alleging both antiboycott and export control violations.

—One particularly significant antiboycott compliance case was recently concluded by an order of February 11, 1993. Under that order, William Hardimon was assessed a civil penalty of \$54,000, and his export privileges were denied for 6 months. Hardimon allegedly refused to do business with another person in order to comply with an illegal Saudi Arabian requirement, complied with an illegal Kuwaiti boycott request, and failed to report the receipt of the boycott requests.

5. The expenses incurred by the Federal Government in the 6-month period from October 1, 1992, to March 31, 1993, that are directly attributable to the exercise of authorities conferred by the declaration of a national emergency with respect to export controls were largely centered in the Department of Commerce, Bureau of Export Administration. Expenditures by the Department of Commerce are anticipated to be \$17,897,000, most of which represents program operating costs, wage and salary costs for Federal personnel, and overhead expenses.

William J. Clinton

The White House,
April 27, 1993.

**Nominations for Ambassadorial Posts
and Navy Department General
Counsel**

April 27, 1993

The President today announced his intention to nominate Steve Honigman to be General Counsel for the Department of the Navy, and his intention to make the following ambassadorial nominations:

Howard Jeter, Ambassador to the Republic of Botswana

William Ramsey, Ambassador to the People's Republic of the Congo

David Romero, Ambassador to the Republic of Ecuador

Alan Flanigan, Ambassador to the Republic of El Salvador

Andrew Winter, Ambassador to the Republic of Gambia

Aurelia Brazeal, Ambassador to the Republic of Kenya

William Dameron, Ambassador to the Republic of Mali

Dennis Jett, Ambassador to the Republic of Mozambique

John Davidson, Ambassador to the Republic of Niger

John Sprott, Ambassador to the Kingdom of Swaziland

David Rawson, Ambassador to the Republic of Rwanda.

"These Ambassadors are a talented and experienced group who will, I am sure, represent our country's interests ably," said the President.

NOTE: Biographies of the nominees were made available by the Office of the Press Secretary.

**Remarks Announcing the Director of
the Office of National Drug Control
Policy and Exchange With Reporters**

April 28, 1993

The President. Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen. Please be seated. I want to thank the members of the Cabinet who are here and the Members of the Congress who are here and express my apologies for the Attorney General who is with the Congress. And that's why some of them and why she is not here.

I want to thank the representatives of law enforcement, people who are involved in drug treatment and drug education, and other citizens who are here with us today, as well as those who have been working in the office of drug policy who are here.

It is a great pleasure and honor for me today to announce the appointment of Lee Brown, the first police officer ever to hold the job of Director of the Office of National Drug Control Policy.

A few weeks ago I elevated this office to Cabinet-level status because I believe drug abuse is as serious a problem as we have in America and because I believe that this office cannot work effectively on its own, no matter how many people it might have. The real ability of this office to make a difference in

the lives of the American people is the ability to work with all the Departments of the National Government and with others who care about this issue to maximize our resources, to focus our efforts, and to make sure we're all working together. Lee Brown shares that view, and I am proud that he has agreed to join us in this administration.

As Americans who care about our future, we can't let drugs and drug-related crimes continue to ruin communities, threaten our children even in schools, and fill up our prisons with wrecked and wasted lives. We have to do a better job of preventing drug use and treating those who seek treatment, and we must do more to protect law-abiding citizens from those who victimize them in the pursuit of drugs or profits from drugs. I'm committed to winning this struggle, as all Americans are, and I'm convinced that there is no better American to lead this effort than Lee Brown. He's been the chief law enforcement officer in Atlanta, in Houston, and New York. He's a policeman with a Ph.D. in criminology who brings to this tough job a truly extraordinary record of innovation in crime reduction and a sensitivity to the problems of real people who want to walk home safe at night and who want to be free of the problems that we're trying to combat.

To reduce drug use and drug-related crimes we have to do many things at the same time. It has to start with community policing, with more police at the local level working with our neighbors and the children and the friends to prevent crime and to quickly punish criminals. There must be better education and prevention efforts starting at the earliest ages. These work; I know that. And there must be treatment for those who want to get better.

Dr. Brown knows a little something about community policing. It's nearly his invention. He turned the Houston police force into a model of community policing. And for many serious crimes, the crime rate there dropped. In New York he added thousands of officers to foot patrols; men and women whom he empowered to solve problems, not with the Federal program but with a commitment to a better life in a particular neighborhood. And reports of serious crime fell where that was done in New York. He's had the vision

to seek conditions clearly and the courage to change what doesn't work. Most importantly, he gets results. And this is exactly what we need in the war against drugs.

I pledge to him and to the American people an exceptionally focused and carefully executed antidrug effort from the National Government. At the heart of our efforts will be more funds for local police officers, more for treatment and more for prevention. We will continue to work with other nations who have shown the political will to fight illegal drugs. They will continue to get our full support and our cooperation.

But it's time we turned our attention home and built a strategy to make the neighborhoods of America safer and more drug-free. We want to close the gap between those who want treatment and available treatment. Treating addiction is good urban policy and good anticrime policy and good health policy. We ask for a 10-percent increase in treatment funds for 1994. And we'll make drug treatment an important part of the national health care plan that will be presented to the Congress and the American people. Our goal is to work toward treatment on demand.

I believe the parents of America want and deserve more help in educating their children about drugs. We can prevent drug abuse. School programs work. Public service programs work. But they aren't miracles. They require a commitment and a consistency year in and year out. We've asked for a 16-percent increase in drug prevention funding.

Finally, we're determined to put more police officers on the street and to expand community policing. It's a local program, old-fashioned law enforcement, but it works. It means less crime. I think it's time to go back to the basics. I asked the Congress to approve \$200 million in the jobs stimulus package for community policing. And I proposed almost \$600 million in policing and other initiatives similar to that in 1994.

The most basic responsibility of the Government is to protect the American people. It's our sacred duty to do our best. I believe we have a good program. It can be a great program if it can come alive in America in every community in this country. It's basic: more officers, more education, more treat-

ment. And with the leadership of Lee Brown it promises to be effective.

I look forward to working with him and with the other members of our Cabinet, administration to meet and to master the challenges ahead.

[At this point, Dr. Brown expressed his appreciation to the President and his commitment to develop a national drug control strategy.]

Law Enforcement Background

Q. Mr. President, you talked about the need to give resources to education and treatment from some of the law enforcement efforts. Why then did you pick someone with a background in law enforcement?

The President. Because I don't think it's an either-or thing. I think having the right kind of community-based education and treatment programs, if they work, also requires having the right kind of community law enforcement strategy. One of the things that I have learned in the many years I served as attorney general and Governor, and talking to other people who have been involved in that, is that if you do it right, all these things go hand in hand.

I wish the Attorney General were here today to talk about the drug courts she started in Miami, and what the relationship of law enforcement there is to integrating a treatment and education program.

That's why I wanted someone who had a background in law enforcement and credibility on that issue, but who believed in innovation and education and treatment to do this job. I wanted someone who could put together a policy that makes sense. If you try to pick one or the other, you're never going to get the job done.

Wolf [Wolf Blitzer, CNN News]?

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, you met last night with a bipartisan group of congressional leaders on the situation in Bosnia. And by all accounts, they seem to have given you some conflicting advice. Many of them appear to be more moved by the lessons of Vietnam than they are by the Holocaust. Did you emerge from that session more confused

about what the United States should do as far as the situation in Bosnia is concerned?

The President. No, I didn't. I still believe the United States has to strengthen its response. But the meeting was helpful because of the practical issues which were raised and the specific suggestions I got from people, many of whom have different views. But some who were there last night are here today; they can make their own comments. But I think it was a very helpful meeting and there were a lot of very specific things that came out of that, and that I think will come out of our consultations over the next couple of days.

Andrea [Andrea Mitchell, NBC News]?

Q. Do you feel that you can continue, though, to consider military options now that so many Members of Congress have strongly expressed their objections? Would you proceed if you felt it was still the right thing to do and if you had allied support?

The President. Well, I will decide what I think the right thing to do is, and then see if I can persuade the Congress and the allies to go along. Right now, what I want to do is to hear what they think the right thing to do is, and the people with whom I consulted last night were good enough to tell me. And we agreed that they would set in motion a process to go back to their committees and try to solicit some more views.

Q. Mr. President, is it accurate——

Drug Trafficking

Q. ——plan to continue with the policy of hot pursuit like in the Machain case, or how are you going to deal with cases like that? Are you going to come to other countries and kidnap or bring to justice in this country a person suspected of a crime in a drug situation, like in the Machain case? How are you going to deal with that situation?

The President. I'm not sure I heard you—the plane flew over. But you asked about the abduction out of Mexico? Is that what you asked about?

Q. That's right—if you are going to continue with that type of policy.

The President. I think I've made my position clear on that. I think the present ruling of law is too broad there. I don't believe that

the United States should be involved in that unless there is a clear and deliberate attempt by a government in another country to undermine extradition or undermine the enforcement of its own laws and our laws on that. So that's been my position for months and months; I haven't changed that.

Bipartisan Support

Q. Mr. President, do you expect to get bipartisan support from Congress for the money you're going to need? The two predecessors of Mr. Brown accomplished certain things, but not much. How will you make sure that Mr. Brown has the money to accomplish—

The President. Well, I think there will be bipartisan support. Keep in mind this is partly a money problem and partly a resource problem. We're going to try to do some different things and attract people who have thought about this issue. I don't think this is a Republican or a Democratic issue. There's hardly a family in America that hasn't been touched directly or indirectly by this problem. So I feel very hopeful about it.

Drug Treatment Funding

Q. —in the budget, sir?

The President. Well, we recommended more funds in the budget, and it's very critical to the whole health reform area. I mean, a big part of our strategy in this is embodied in the proposals we'll make on health care to deal with the whole treatment issue.

Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International]?

Bosnia

Q. When do you think you will have a decision? Do you have Yeltsin on board now to do more? And do you think the American people will support a military—[inaudible]—use of military force?

The President. Well, you asked me three questions. I think there will be a decision soon. We are working very hard on it. There are a lot of very practical questions that have to be asked and answered. As you know, it is a very difficult matter.

I believe that when we do make a decision, we will be, as we have been all along, consulting with our allies in the United Nations. And I think there is a fair chance that we'll be

able to get the U.N. to go along with what we decide to do if we have some consultations as we go along; as we have.

I think President Yeltsin—I don't know what he will say. It depends in part, obviously, on what we recommend. But I'll tell you this: I've been very pleased by the positions that he has taken both publicly and privately recently. And even in the midst of his own election, when it might have hurt him politically, Russia did not veto our attempts to get much tougher sanctions. And I think he's been pretty clear since the election that he's not at all happy about the continuation of Serbian aggression and the refusal to negotiate in good faith and try to settle this war and stop the ethnic cleansing. So I feel pretty good about that.

Q. Mr. President, how are you going to tell the American people—

Office of National Drug Control Policy

Q. Mr. President, a former drug czar, Bill Bennett, said today that you have gutted the office by cutting it down, cutting the personnel. How do you answer that?

The President. Well, my answer to that—maybe I should refer you to Congressman Rangel. I spoke with him when we were trying to figure out what to do about this budget. And what I perceived happened in that office before is that it was a large office that operated basically separate from the rest of the Government. It has no legal authority to compel the behavior of any law enforcement officials, and it obviously has no legal authority over all the State and local people and the nonprofit people who are involved in drug education and treatment. So the real issue is whether it has the mechanisms necessary to pull all the levers in the Federal Government and pull people together.

And I think by putting the office in the Cabinet, by coordinating all of our national policies throughout the Federal Government, and by having a staff that can support that function, it's much more likely that we're going to be effective.

And I also would tell you that I believe in rhetoric in the war against drugs. I know that works. I think the education programs work, the prevention programs work, but it needs to be more than rhetoric. And I think

it will also be perceived that I have appointed the most experienced person with the best record and the least political person who ever held this job. And I think that will count for something, too, with the Republicans and the Democrats.

Take Our Daughters to Work Day

Q. Where's Chelsea?

The President. Well, we discussed it this morning and she said, "You know, it's easier for me; you work where you live. I know what it's like." She said, "I missed a lot of school last month, so I'm going to school."

Q. Would she have gone to work with you or Hillary?

The President. Actually, she thought it was just for mothers to take their daughters. I said, "No, no, fathers can, too." She said, "Well, you both work where you live. I'm going to school." But she's spent some time with us over here.

Health Care Plan

Q. Have you firmly decided not to delay health care because it might risk your budget proposal, sir?

The President. I think what we're talking about is not a risk.

Thank you very much.

NOTE: The President spoke at 12:30 p.m. in the Rose Garden at the White House. A biography of the nominee was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary. A portion of the exchange could not be verified because the tape was incomplete.

**Letter to Congressional Leaders
Transmitting a Report on
Nonproliferation in South Asia**

April 28, 1993

Dear Mr. Speaker: (Dear Mr. Chairman:)

As required under section 620F(c) of the Foreign Operations, Export Financing, and Related Programs Appropriations Act, 1993 (22 U.S.C. 2376(c)), I am transmitting a report entitled "Progress Toward Regional Nonproliferation in South Asia." The report is unclassified.

This is the first report required on this subject and reflects information available as of

March 19, 1993. Events after March 18, 1993, will be included in the next report.

Sincerely,

William J. Clinton

NOTE: Identical letters were sent to Thomas S. Foley, Speaker of the House of Representatives; William H. Natcher, chairman, House Committee on Appropriations; Robert C. Byrd, chairman, Senate Committee on Appropriations; and Claiborne Pell, chairman, Senate Committee on Foreign Relations.

**Proclamation 6550—Jewish Heritage
Week, 1993**

April 28, 1993

*By the President of the United States
of America*

A Proclamation

The essence of America's greatness has always been the diversity of its people. From the times of native settlement through the immigration of people from hundreds of other countries, the United States has gained immeasurably from the strengths of the peoples who have come to our shores. The Jewish community is an important part of this legacy.

Jewish citizens have contributed their knowledge and skills to every field of endeavor, including education, business, industry, science, and the arts. Their names are permanently etched in America's history books, and the Jewish community's rich heritage and culture pervade all aspects of American society.

Throughout the years, immigrating to America meant educational and economic opportunity, as well as freedom from oppression, for the Jewish people. For people who suffered under the yoke of dictators and ethnic hatred, America's democracy offered a chance for political involvement and religious liberty.

By wagon and train, by horseback and all other means of conveyance, the Jewish people have traveled across the vast expanse of America to create prosperous and rewarding lives for themselves. In the process, they have

improved the social, political, and economic fabric of our Nation. To celebrate these contributions and recognize the people, traditions, and culture of the Jewish faith, the Congress, by Senate Joint Resolution 30, has designated the week of April 25, 1993, through May 2, 1993, as "Jewish Heritage Week" and has authorized and requested the President to issue a proclamation in observance of this week.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim the week of April 25, 1993, through May 2, 1993, as Jewish Heritage Week. I call upon the people of the United States to observe the week with appropriate programs, ceremonies, and activities.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this twenty-eighth day of April, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-three, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and seventeenth.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 5:02 p.m., April 28, 1993]

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on April 30.

Proclamation 6551—National Crime Victims' Rights Week, 1993

April 28, 1993

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Every day, thousands of men, women, and children are murdered, raped, robbed, beaten, or abused. They are the innocent victims of crime in the streets, towns, and homes of America.

Fortunately, crime victims in this country are not left alone to try to recover from the physical, emotional, and financial distress of victimization. Thousands of dedicated Americans are working tirelessly at the Federal, State, and local levels to provide comfort and financial assistance and to advocate for fair treatment. These advocates help the innocent victims of crime to recover from the

trauma of victimization and to navigate the often emotionally difficult criminal justice process. "National Crime Victims' Rights Week" provides a special opportunity for us to demonstrate our appreciation to these selfless advocates and to renew our commitment to the needs and rights of crime victims.

Much has been accomplished during the past two decades to institutionalize victims' rights in this country. Bills of rights have been enacted at the Federal level and by 49 State governments to codify certain essential protections for victims. All 50 States now have crime victim compensation programs. Federal assistance under the Victims of Crime Act continues to supplement State crime victim compensation programs, support programs that provide direct assistance to crime victims, establish assistance for Native Americans who have been victimized, and provide training to increase the sensitivity of criminal justice practitioners to the special needs of crime victims.

While these gains are significant, there is still much that must be done to combat the crime trends that further threaten our communities. We must continue to work together to prevent crime and to protect ourselves, our families, and our fellow Americans from violence. We must work to provide opportunity where despair reigns. We must work together to ensure that hardened criminals who prey upon the innocent receive punishment commensurate with the harm—physical, emotional, and financial—that they have inflicted. And we must continue to work together to ensure that the innocent victims of crime receive the services they need and fair treatment by our Nation's criminal justice system.

The Congress, by Senate Joint Resolution 62, has designated the week of April 25 through May 1, 1993, as National Crime Victims' Rights Week and has authorized and requested the President to issue a proclamation in observance of this week.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim the week of April 25 through May 1, 1993, as National Crime Victims' Rights Week. I urge all Americans to join in honoring those who work in behalf of crime victims and their families and to

commit themselves to working together with their neighbors for safer streets, safer schools, and brighter tomorrows for all our citizens.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this twenty-eighth day of April, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-three, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and seventeenth.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 5:03 p.m., April 28, 1993].

NOTE: This proclamation was published in the *Federal Register* on April 30.

Statement by the Press Secretary on the President's Meeting With the Dalai Lama

April 28, 1993

The President and the Vice President met yesterday with His Holiness the Dalai Lama and discussed issues relating to Tibet.

"The Dalai Lama is internationally revered for his spiritual and moral leadership," the President said. "As a Nobel Peace Prize winner and committed advocate of nonviolent change and resolution of disputes, I deeply appreciated hearing the Dalai Lama's views on the situation in China, including Tibet. The administration continues to urge Beijing and the Dalai Lama to revive a dialog between them and presses China to address human rights abuses in Tibet."

Nominations for an Assistant Secretary of Education and Energy Information Administrator

April 28, 1993

The President announced today that he intends to nominate former San Francisco superintendent of schools Ramon Cortines to be Assistant Secretary of Education for Intergovernmental and Interagency Affairs and Jay Hakes, a top aide to Senator Bob Graham of Florida, to be Administrator of the Energy Information Administration.

"Ramon Cortines and Jay Hakes have both distinguished themselves as public servants in their own States and at the national level," said the President. "I am grateful that they have agreed to continue their service as part of my administration."

NOTE: Biographies of the nominees were made available by the Office of the Press Secretary.

Nomination of Arthur Levitt To Be Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission

April 28, 1993

The President today announced his intention to nominate Arthur Levitt, Jr., owner of the Capitol Hill newspaper Roll Call and formerly chairman of the American Stock Exchange, as a member of the Securities and Exchange Commission. Once Mr. Levitt is confirmed as a member, the President intends to designate him Chairman of the SEC.

"Backed by 20 years of experience in high finance and newly introduced to the workings of Capitol Hill, Arthur Levitt is well prepared to take the helm at the SEC," the President said. "I have full confidence he will use his office wisely to strengthen public confidence in our country's financial agencies."

NOTE: A biography of the nominee was made available by the Office of the Press Secretary.

Proclamation 6552—Death of Cesar Chavez

April 28, 1993

By the President of the United States of America

A Proclamation

Cesar Chavez came from the humble yet proud beginnings of a migrant worker to lead those same workers in a movement that irreversibly shaped our Nation and brought justice and dignity to thousands. After the Depression forced young Cesar and his family

from their ranch, he began working in the fields at an early age. His family traveled throughout California following the seasonal work, and he attended nearly 70 schools before dropping out to help support his family. Although his formal education ended after the seventh grade, Cesar learned much from the courageous example of his parents. Often among the first to resist exploitation and to stand up to injustice, they instilled in Cesar a profound respect for the intrinsic value of each human person, and a fervent desire to protect that value. Inspired by the teachings of a Catholic priest and by the writings of Ghandi and other great civil leaders, Cesar rose to become one of the great labor leaders of our time.

The United Farm Workers, the union he founded and led for almost three decades, became a symbol of empowerment and pride for many workers. Cesar's innate understanding of the problems facing migrant workers allowed him to organize thousands of farm workers across the Nation. With natural leadership and unflagging determination, he achieved real progress where others had failed.

His insistence on nonviolent tactics stood in stark contrast to the bitterness and brutality that were used in resistance. The strength of his vision and the power of his leadership enabled him to take his struggle directly to the American people. He focused our Nation's attention on the economic and social plight of migrant farm workers and, in the process, taught us how injustice anywhere affects us everywhere.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, by the authority vested in me by the Constitution and laws of the United States, in tribute to the memory of Cesar Chavez, do hereby call upon the citizens of this great Nation to reflect on and honor the life of this distinguished leader, veteran, and American.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this twenty-eighth day of April, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-three, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and seventeenth.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 11:41 a.m., April 29, 1993]

NOTE: This proclamation was released by the Office of the Press Secretary on April 29, and it was published in the *Federal Register* on April 30.

Remarks Prior to a Meeting With Members of the House Ways and Means Committee and an Exchange With Reporters

April 29, 1993

The President. Let me just make a brief remark, and then I'll answer your questions.

First, I want to thank these members of the Ways and Means Committee for coming in for this meeting. This morning's economic figures on the performance of the United States economy in the first 3 months of the year clearly, I think, support the policies of this administration. They support filling out and implementing the budget commitment that the Congress has made to reduce the deficit and to increase targeted investments and to generate jobs.

It also plainly proves, I think, that the administration was right in trying to hedge against this economic slow growth by passing the jobs bill that the House of Representatives passed and that the Senate wanted to pass. It proves that we were right in both reducing the deficit and in trying to create some jobs right now in this economy. But it also proves that the long-term interests of the country will be served if we fulfill our commitments on the budget.

The budget, I think, is well under way. The Ways and Means Committee had a good day yesterday. And I think we can continue to show our commitment to bring the deficit down and to target our investments in areas that will create jobs. We'll have a long-term plan that's good. But it also proves, I think clearly, beyond any doubt, that the strategy of the administration to create some more jobs right now was the right strategy. The American people still need more employment, and we're going to do our best to give it to them.

The First 100 Days

Q. Mr. President, 100 days, have there been mistakes? Are there things you would do differently? What have you learned, what lessons?

The President. Well, I learned that things are not going to change quite as fast as I wanted them to. But I noticed there was—one columnist a day or two ago in one of the major papers pointed out that at least the American people know that the Democratic Party is serious and the President is serious about deficit reduction. They know we're going to do something about health care reform. They know we're going to try to be partners with the private sector in rebuilding the economy. And they know we're trying to make the Government work again, with the national service program that I will announce tomorrow and a whole other range of issues to try to give people educational and other opportunities. So I feel basically quite good about what's happened.

But this country has some serious problems, and we're going to have to get everybody serious about dealing with the problems. Now, I am very impressed so far with the work that we've been able to do with the House and with the majority in the Senate in getting the deficit down and in focusing on the investment needs of our people. But we've got a lot of work to do.

I don't know that 100 days is a rational category, but if you look at how much we've done and how much is well underway now as compared with most previous administrations in a similar time period, I think we're doing pretty well.

Q. Did you take on too much, Mr. President?

Bosnia

Q. Have you reached a decision on Bosnia yet, Mr. President?

The President. Helen [Helen Thomas, United Press International], I have not. As you probably know, General Powell was away for most of the week in Europe. And I want to see and talk with him personally and have some other consultations on some of the military issues. And I have not. But we will do so soon, and then we'll begin some pretty aggressive consultations with our allies.

President's Agenda

Q. [Inaudible]—took on too much, Mr. President? Do you have some concerns about that?

The President. No, I will. You know, it's a question of—the Vice President has a word for it, sequence and timing, I think he calls it. I believe I got hired to try to do something about the economy and the health care issue, and to try to promote political reform and many other things we're trying to do. When we put all these things out here, I don't expect them all to be resolved right away. But I think we're going to focus on the budget first. That's what we're doing today. Then we're going to take up, we're going to focus on health care.

But this country still needs to remember that we've got to do these things to put people back to work and to solve their economic problems. That is the issue, the economy. And that is what we are spending—I'm spending two-thirds of my time or more on the economy and health care. And that's what I hope we can do in the Congress in the few weeks ahead.

Q. So you're more optimistic than Mr. Panetta? You're more optimistic than Mr. Panetta?

The President. I have more faith in Mr. Panetta's colleagues than he does. [Laughter]

I think we're going to bring this deficit down, and I think we're going to get some investments passed. I think we're going to turn this economy around. I wish we could have done it faster. I still think we ought to create some jobs now. I think that was a mistake. But I think we just keep going. We'll make the progress we can and go on.

NOTE: The President spoke at 10:20 a.m. in the Roosevelt Room at the White House. A tape was not available for verification of the content of these remarks.

Remarks to Justice Department Employees

April 29, 1993

Thank you very much. When Janet Reno was confirmed, she said she never wanted

to be called General, but only Janet. But somehow I feel I should call her General. She certainly seemed in command to me yesterday up on the Hill.

I want to say to all of you what an incredible honor it has been for me as a citizen of this country, as well as President, to be in the Justice Department for the first time, to walk down the halls and to see the wonderful work that was done more than 50 years ago now in building this great building during the Great Depression, when President Roosevelt was trying to lift the spirits of the country by putting the people to work—that's still a pretty good idea, I think; to walk into the Attorney General's office and see the magnificent portrait of Robert Kennedy, who was my favorite Attorney General from my childhood; and mostly just to shake hands with all the employees here. I think it is so easy for us to forget, in the ebb and flow of events when we were so focused on the moment, and easy for the American people to forget that every day there are so many Americans who could have chosen a different life, who get up every day and come to work in this building because they believe in simple justice and fairness and in doing right by the American people. And I want you to know that I appreciate that very, very much, and I thank you for your service.

After years of taking a different course, I am doing my best to turn this Government around, to change the way things operate here, to convince the American people that we are serious about the economy, serious about reducing the deficit, serious about investing in the real needs of our people, serious about providing fairness to the middle class and to others who are willing to work hard and play by the rules in America, and serious about trying to bring all the people of this country together again in a great national community in which we all recognize that we are in this together.

The changes we are making go well beyond policy and particular bills and, I hope, beyond politics to a whole new idea of hope in this country as we move toward the 21st century, the idea that we can keep the American dream alive, preserve our basic values, and make the new future that all of you and your children deserve.

I thought about this a lot when I was attorney general, that when you work to ensure the full protection of the law for every citizen, you help to sustain the most fundamental values of democracy and, indeed, to provide for the freedom of all. I know most of you came here with similar feelings for the law. I have enormous respect for your motives. I come from a generation that revered the law because we believed it gave us the tools to help people and, in my part of the country, that it was the only instrument that would ever enable us all, black and white together, to live as equals.

I still believe those things. Today before I came over here, I had a whole string of people into my office who I had known for years and years and years, and they were laughing about how sometimes I may seem almost naive because I genuinely feel more idealism and hope today than I did in the first day I entered public life, than I did on the first day I cast a vote as a young man. I still believe that we can make a difference, that we can live up to the ideals enshrined in the Constitution, and that we have the obligation to do so. And I asked Janet Reno to become the Attorney General of the United States because I knew she believed that, too.

Since I became President I have spent a good deal of time trying to focus on law enforcement issues, because I saw all across this land in the last year and a half when I ran for President the enormous amount of insecurity and fear that so many Americans felt, living in their homes, walking on their streets. Many of you may have heard me tell this story, at least in the media, before, but one of the most gripping things that ever happened to me in the race for President occurred in a hotel in New York.

It was about a week before the New Hampshire primary. I looked like I was yesterday's news, to say the least. I was walking through this corridor to go to a big fundraiser full of people who wondered why they had bought tickets. I was feeling sorry for myself. And a man who worked in the hotel as a waiter stuck his hand out and grabbed my hand, and he said, "My 10-year-old boy studies the Presidential race in school, and he says you should be President, so I will be

for you. I'm an immigrant from Greece." And he said, "I will be for you because my boy wants me to be." But he said, "You know, where I came from we were so much poorer, but at least we were free." And he said, "Now when my boy walks outside from our apartment, he cannot go across the street and play in the park unless I am with him because he won't be safe. We live only two blocks from the school, and he cannot walk to his school unless I am with him because he won't be safe. So if I do what my boy wants me to do and I vote for you, will you make my boy free?"

And all of a sudden I couldn't remember what I was feeling sorry for myself about. But I did remember one of the reasons that I wanted to be President and one of the solemn duties of the Government of the United States and every other law enforcement jurisdiction in this country. And I think it's time that we move from the incredible gulf between rhetoric and reality to doing some very specific things that will make the American people safer. We ought to pass and sign the Brady bill.

I will propose a major new safe schools program so that children at least can be drug free and safe in their schools. I have just appointed Lee Brown, who was the police chief of Atlanta, Houston, and New York City, to be the Director of the Drug Control Office, the first police officer ever to hold that position, a person who pioneered community policing and actually can show how the crime rate went down in communities where there were enough police officers on the street to walk the beat and know their neighbors and work to prevent crime, not just to catch criminals after crimes had occurred. I have asked for more resources for drug education programs and treatment programs. And I want to increase police presence in our communities, so I've asked for substantial new funding to eventually add up to 100,000 more police officers on our streets.

Some of them will come, I hope, through the crime bill that I hope we can pass this year that was filibustered last year. That's a thing, institution, I've learned to have less and less respect for as we go along. [*Laughter*] Some of them will come from incentives we give, from people coming out of the serv-

ice as we build down our armed services and give people incentives to move into police or teaching. Some of them will come from the national service corps, which we will announce tomorrow in New Orleans, as people who will pay off their college loans by working as police officers. I had hoped that some would come from the jobs program, which contained \$200 million for more police officers. But we are going to work together to do this. When I sat in the Attorney General's office just a few moments ago, it's the second issue she brought up. She said, we've still got to deliver for the American people. We have to give them the police officers they need and the security they need. And we're going to do it.

I also want our Government to set an example. I want us to have a tougher child support enforcement program. I've asked my appointees to adhere to the strictest ethics law ever applied to executive branch appointees. I have cut my own White House staff and begun a Governmentwide review of every program we operate, so that we can show the American people we are trying to be accountable and responsible and effective and that we're trying to make sure that when we do something in Washington, it's for the good of the people out there who pay the bills and not just for ourselves.

Our country is great because we have succeeded over 200 years in providing opportunity to all, freedom of speech and worship and association to all, providing equal justice to all. We have become the custodian of freedom's dream for the entire world because people like you have decided to give your lives to this great call.

My goals for this Justice Department are simple. I want it to be free of political controversy and political abuse. I want it to be an innovator in crime reduction and in law enforcement. I want it to create a genuine partnership with those who work with us in State and local systems of justice. I want it to set an example in the practice of law and in the protection of civil rights that will make all Americans proud. And I want the American people to believe that you are their partners in making our communities, our children, and our families safe again.

In closing, let me say how very, very proud I am to name these seven Attorneys General, Assistant Attorneys General, to your Justice Department team. Some of them are new to me; some I have known and admired a very long time. At least one of them once sued me; shows you how broadminded I am. [Laughter] And I can tell you, I am very pleased that each of them has agreed to join our administration.

This may surprise you if you've been reading the press reports, but with these appointments, our administration has in 100 days nominated 172 people for consideration by the Senate. At the same point in their administrations, President Reagan had named 152 people, and President Bush had named 99. By any measure, we're doing a fairly good job in staffing up this administration with high-quality folks. And I might add, since I look across here I can't resist saying, a third of them are women, for a change.

Today when I walked through these halls and I went to the Attorney General's office, I couldn't help but remember that it was 25 years ago in this springtime when Robert Kennedy, by then a Senator from New York, was running for President and was subsequently killed, just 2 days before I graduated from college, with one of my roommates working in his office. It's impossible for me still, especially now as I think back across those 25 years, not to be moved by his memory and his work and the power of the example he set for all Americans, regardless of their gender or color or station in life.

I hope 25 years from now, another daughter or son of America will walk in here and remember what you have accomplished here and be moved. I believe the tradition of greatness here is still very much alive. I believe that Janet Reno and the team that she is assembling can bring it to life for all Americans. The American people want you to succeed in your work; I do, too. Working together, we can be proud to honor the tradition of the Justice Department by ensuring its great future.

Thank you all, and God bless you.

NOTE: The President spoke at 1:12 p.m. in the Courtyard at the Department of Justice.

The President named the following Assistant Attorneys General:

Walter Dellinger, Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Legal Counsel;

Lani Guinier, Assistant Attorney General for the Civil Rights Division;

Frank W. Hunger, Assistant Attorney General for the Civil Division;

Anne K. Bingaman, Assistant Attorney General for the Antitrust Division;

Eleanor Dean Acheson, Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Policy Development;

Sheila Foster Anthony, Assistant Attorney General for the Office of Legislative Affairs;

Gerald Torres, Assistant Attorney General for the Environment and Natural Resources Division.

Biographies of the nominees were made available by the Office of the Press Secretary.

Remarks at a Reception for the President's Health Care Task Force

April 29, 1993

The President. Thank you very much. Let me say how pleased I am that one of the things that even people who care about health care can't control, the weather, cooperated with us today. How delighted we are to have you here to just say a simple thank you for all the work you've done.

I have a few other things I want to say, but I think I should begin by introducing the First Lady by way of saying that 10 years ago we tried this once before when I was Governor of our State. And it was obvious that we needed to dramatically overhaul our education system, and I asked her to chair this committee. And she looked at me as if I had lost my mind because we knew we had to make everybody in the State mad to do what needed to be done. And it turned out to be all right. We had to change a lot of things, but it was one of those remarkable moments in history when all the people were ahead of all the policymakers.

I think we may be there again with health care. And I think that if all of this works I will be once again indebted to my wonderful wife and all of you. And I just want you to know that she has sung your praises to the

Moon from the beginning of this. And so I hope that you think that she did as good a job as she thinks you did, because I think you were both pretty great. Thank you very much.

[At this point, Hillary Clinton and Tipper Gore made statements welcoming the task force and commending their efforts.]

The President. Thank you very much. You know, I wish there were something more I could do for all of you. I think you deserve a medal just for putting up with Ira's toll-gates. I can't believe Ira's hiding back there. He's probably sharpening darts or something. *[Laughter]*

I want to say a special word of thanks to Tipper Gore for her involvement and for the work that she's done to personally sensitize me to a lot of the mental health issues that I think all Americans need to know more about.

I want to say, too, that the Vice President is not here tonight because he is on an errand for our administration in Florida and could not be here. But he sat in all those meetings with me, that we had, long hours trying to make sure that we understood the implications of every issue and understood all the incredible work that all of you have done.

I want to say a special word of thanks to Ira. Hillary and I have known Ira a long time. Ira and I were at Oxford together back in the late sixties, and we always used to say when Ira walked into a room he doubled the IQ of whoever was in there, however many people were in there. *[Laughter]* I don't know how many of his brain cells he has departed forever in this endeavor, but—*[laughter]*—I hope that part of this endeavor will lead some of you to encourage him to take more care of his health. I don't think he's had any sleep since this whole thing started. He's really been a champ, and Hillary and I are very grateful for his efforts.

I want to say, too, that there are a lot of people who said, well—I mean, I never could believe this—for years and years and years we all complained of gridlock and do-nothing and nothing ever got done. And the last 5 days, I see all these articles complaining that I'm trying to do too much. *[Laughter]* I plead guilty to that.

But the overwhelming focus of this administration has been on the economy, jobs, deficit reduction, and investment in our people and on health care. That's what we have focused on, the things that will lift this country up again and bring this country together again and give people some measure of security, even as they go out in the highly changed and charged world that we're moving toward.

I wish I could write a book. I wish I could even remember all the incredible stories I heard along this last year and a half when we were out on the campaign trail, related to health care.

I'll never forget the woman I met in Columbus, Ohio who had six or seven kids and had to give up a \$50,000 a year job because one of her children was so sick, and the only way she could get any care was to become Medicaid eligible; the farmers that I met along the way who couldn't get health insurance, or if they did, it took up the whole profit from the farms in the average years; the small-business person I met who had only four employees and was chagrined because of the exploding cost of insurance in his small group, he had to go to a \$2,500 deductible, and how badly he felt for his own employees; the big businesses that told me about their inability to compete in a global economy because they had to spot their competitors so much; the doctors that I know who wanted to be good doctors and wanted to reach out to people who were spending more and more of their time and money on paperwork and regulation, and on and on and on.

The human dimension of this issue is utterly enormous. The economic dimension is also very great. We're here, struggling to really be serious about reducing the Government's deficit, and under every scenario we can cut it quite a bit in the next 5 years, and then it starts to go right up again because of health care costs. So there has rarely been a time in the history of this country when an economic issue and a social issue, when an issue that affects all the big people and all the little people and all the people in between has been so tightly joined, as this health care issue.

I know there are those who say, "Well, we shouldn't try to deal with this. It ought to be enough just to have a fundamental budget

that dramatically changes the priorities of America." But if you want to get rid of the deficit and have any money left to invest in your children and your education, your economy and your future, we have to do both.

And so I just want to reaffirm to you that all of your efforts have not been in vain, and I'm going to do my best to give us a health care reform package that can pass the Congress this year. And I'm going to do my best to fight for it, and I hope you will, too.

It may be that we can only do one thing at a time in this town. That may be, but I'm not prepared to acknowledge that. Congress has worked out smaller bills, but they're all different. I mean, they've got an agreement on the family and medical leave, and now they're apparently going to send me the motor voter bill I've been working on. And today, they voted for a modified line-item veto in the House, which I thought was remarkable, the first bill we've had with real bipartisan support.

I think we can do more than one thing. And I think if people understand that you have to do both of these things—have a new budget and a new direction and a new approach to health care to get control of our deficit and our financial future and to have something left to invest in our people, our economy, and our own future, I think we can do it.

And I just have to ask all of you to be committed now to be agents of change. You've done all this work on this program. And you know, the final thing we come out with, none of you will agree with all of it. I won't agree with all of it. We're going to do the best we can to put something together that's good for America and that we can get through the United States Congress. And we're going to do our best to continue to reach out to both Democrats and Republicans as we have throughout this entire process, to try to make this an American effort, not a Bill Clinton effort, not a Democratic effort, not a Republican effort, but an American effort. America needs this.

I'll say this: You know, when this group began to get together, I kept reading all this stuff about secrecy. And you know, shoot, I've read more about everything you've done in the press than anything else I've seen.

[*Laughter*] If you can't keep a secret in Washington with two people, you sure can't keep a secret with 1,000. [*Laughter*]

I think you've been great. I want to ask you to commit now to do what you can. A lot of you don't come from here. A lot of you live out in the country where a lot of these problems are being grappled with. When you go home, try to mobilize your friends to tell your Members of Congress that the time is now. The time is now to deal with this. And if you do live here and you have even more contacts on the Hill or with others that can influence this process, use your time now to pass it. Don't let all your work have been in vain. This is a magic moment in the history of this issue. People have been working for decades just to have the circumstances which exist now. And I hardly see anybody who doesn't admit that the time has come to do something, to do something bold and do something substantial, to do something we can live with from years to come that will really make our country better off, our people more secure, healthier, and happier.

We're going to have enough insecurity as it is in America, and everybody is, with all the changes that are going on in this world. The least we can do is to join the mainstream of the world in taking care of our people better, providing a comprehensive, affordable, good, quality health care system. And it's good for the economy. If we can get that idea across, we can prevail.

I need your help now to carry the fight to the floors of the Congress, both Chambers and both parties. And let's lift this issue up. Let's keep it high in America's mind and heart, and let's make sure that all this work you have done will be rewarded for generations to come.

This is a real moment in the history of this country. You can be a part of it. Now the time has come to bring it home.

Thank you very much.

Bosnia

Q. Mr. President, does this reconvening of the peace talks take the pressure off you at all, sir?

The President. Well, let's see what happens there. Let's see what happens. Let's see

how serious they are. You know, they've said things before and not meant it. If they mean it now, so much the better. I'll see.

Q. How are you going to know if they mean it, sir?

The President. We will know them by their deeds, not their words.

NOTE: The President spoke at 6:38 p.m. on the South Lawn at the White House. In his remarks, he referred to Ira Magaziner, Senior Adviser to the President for Policy Development.

Statement on the National Commission To Ensure a Strong Competitive Airline Industry

April 29, 1993

Today, I am, in conjunction with the bipartisan congressional leadership, releasing the names of the members of the National Commission to Ensure a Strong and Competitive Airline Industry.

This Commission will enable us to start planning the revitalization of one of our country's most important industries, one of our most important exporters, one of our Nation's most important employers: the aircraft manufacturers and carriers that have been the pride of the United States and the world's leaders since the beginning of aviation. I pledge that this Commission will have the full resources of every Agency of the Federal Government at its disposal.

Each of the individuals on this Commission brings a strong record of accomplishment in his or her field, together with a keen sense of the importance of aviation in a global economy. Each of them has demonstrated the ability to look toward the future and the energy and intellect to shape the course of the current airline debate.

I would like to thank the bipartisan congressional leadership for their support and leadership in creating this Commission and in selecting persons of such high caliber.

The Chairman of the Commission will be an old friend and former colleague of mine, former Virginia Governor Gerald L. Baliles. Perhaps no other Governor in the past decade devoted more thought and attention to the global nature of the challenges facing his State. Governor Baliles always recognized

that the nature of competition had changed fundamentally and that any strategy to shape that change must be rooted in a vision extending beyond our borders. He recognized that aviation is the lifeblood of commerce in a global economy and made it an important part of his State's competitiveness strategy. That is what we must do now at a national level.

As the legislation creating this Commission was debated in Congress, it became clear that there are many different explanations of why our airline carriers and manufacturers are facing such financial difficulty. And those issues will be debated. But it will be valuable for the Commission to take a step back from that debate and examine the context in which the aviation industry operates. To the extent the Commission can help us understand how we got to where we are today and provide a vision for a competitive future, it will have rendered an invaluable service. I look forward to receiving their report and pledge the full cooperation of my entire administration in their work.

NOTE: The Office of the Press Secretary announced the membership of the Commission as follows:

The members of the Commission appointed by the President are:

Gerald L. Baliles, Chair, partner, Hunton & Williams, and former Governor of Virginia, Richmond, VA

Bette B. Anderson, president, Kelly, Anderson and Associates, Inc., Washington, DC

Sylvia A. de Leon, partner, Akin, Gump, Strauss, Hauer and Feld, Washington, DC

Herbert D. Kelleher, chief executive officer, Southwest Airlines, Dallas, TX

Gina F. Thomas, managing attorney for international and regulatory affairs, Federal Express Corp., Memphis, TN

The members appointed by the Senate are:

Charles "Chip" M. Barclay, president, the American Association of Airport Executives, Washington, DC

Robert F. Daniell, chief executive officer, United Technologies, West Hartford, CT

Felix G. Rohatyn, managing partner, Lazard Freres and Co., New York, NY

Russell W. Meyer, Jr., chairman and chief executive officer, Cesna Aircraft Company, Wichita, KS

Abraham D. Sofaer, partner, Hughes, Hubbard and Reed, Washington, DC

The members appointed by the House are:

Captain J. Randolph Babbitt, president, Airline Pilots Association (ALPA), Oakton, VA

John Peterpaul, vice president, International Association of Machinists (IAM), Silver Spring, MD

Sandra Pianalto, first vice president, Federal Reserve Bank, Cleveland, OH

John E. Robson, Lister Crown distinguished faculty fellow, Yale University, New Haven, CT

Daniel M. Kasper, director of Transportation Practice, Harbridge House, Inc., Boston, MA

The ex-officio (non-voting) members are:

Laura D'Andrea Tyson, Chair, President's Council of Economic Advisers, CA

Senator J. James Exon, NE

Senator Ernest Hollings, SC

Senator Patty Murray, WA

Senator John Danforth, MO

Senator Slade Gorton, WA

Representative Richard Gephardt, MO

Representative Robert Borski, PA

Representative Maria Cantwell, WA

Representative Newt Gingrich, GA

Representative Bud Shuster, PA

Proclamation 6553—National Day of Prayer, 1993

April 30, 1993

*By the President of the United States
of America*

A Proclamation

The American people were the first to define a nation in terms of both spirituality and human liberty. Throughout our Nation's history, America has been a beacon for millions in search of spiritual and religious freedom. Immigrants have come to the United States seeking not just freedom from persecution and discrimination, but also freedom for the right of self-determination. On this National Day of Prayer, we reaffirm this fundamental

freedom of religion that has made our Nation so strong.

Thomas Jefferson understood the greater purpose of the liberty that our Founding Fathers sought during the creation of our Nation. Although it was against the British that the colonists fought for political rights, the true source of the rights of man was clearly stated in the Declaration of Independence. Jefferson wrote that all humans are "endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable Rights" It was self-evident to him that denying these rights was wrong and that he and others must struggle to win what was theirs.

The epic struggle of the Revolutionary War and the vigilance that the protection of our rights has required have embedded in our Nation a profound understanding of the true meaning and value of our freedom. With the rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness comes the duty to use those rights for the good of humankind. This belief is fundamental to the American tradition. The result of our Founding Fathers' conception of a state created by man through the responsible use of God-given rights is a Nation of unparalleled freedom and dazzling diversity.

Today we face great challenges. The diversity that gives us so much strength is often seen as a source of division. We are searching for solutions to the difficult challenges of providing a safe and rewarding future for our children, securing adequate health care for our people, and of building good, nurturing communities.

Through prayer our people take a moment away from the concerns of everyday life to understand the greater power that gives us guidance. We come together in an act common to all religions. Prayer gives us a quiet space to remember and contemplate the greater purpose of the activity that fills our lives. As a Nation, we understand the common bonds we all share, and we recommit ourselves to serving a greater good. Prayer enables us to rejoice in our freedoms and understand the implicit responsibility that accompanies them. We return to the guiding vision that gives our Nation so much vitality.

By joint resolution of the Congress, approved April 17, 1952, the people have recognized the role of spiritual reaffirmation and

prayer in our history by setting aside a particular day each year as a "National Day of Prayer." Since 1952, each President has proclaimed an annual National Day of Prayer, resuming the tradition begun by our Founding Fathers in 1776. By Public Law 100-307, the first Thursday in May of each year has been set aside as a National Day of Prayer.

Now, Therefore, I, William J. Clinton, President of the United States of America, do hereby proclaim May 6, 1993, as a National Day of Prayer. I call upon the citizens of this great Nation to pray, each after his or her own manner, to remember those who are in need, to achieve patience in tribulation, to resolve the problems that divide us, to rejoice in hope, and to express thanks for the abundance we have experienced throughout our history.

In Witness Whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this thirtieth day of April, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred and ninety-three, and of the Independence of the United States of America the two hundred and seventeenth.

William J. Clinton

[Filed with the Office of the Federal Register, 4:59 p.m., April 30, 1993]

NOTE: This proclamation will be published in the *Federal Register* on May 4.

Digest of Other White House Announcements

The following list includes the President's public schedule and other items of general interest announced by the Office of the Press Secretary and not included elsewhere in this issue.

April 24

In the morning, the President and Hillary Clinton traveled to Jamestown, VA, where they went sightseeing with several family members. Later, the President traveled to

Williamsburg where he attended the Senate Democrats Conference and remained overnight.

April 25

In the morning, the President traveled to Boston, MA, and returned to Washington, DC, later that evening.

April 26

The President announced the establishment of a National Biological Survey, which is to be created by reorganizing and upgrading current biological research programs within the Interior Department.

April 27

In the afternoon, the President met with congressional leaders.

In the evening, the President attended "A salute to Joe Moakley" reception at the Hyatt Regency Hotel and later attended the National Endowment for Democracy reception at the Capitol Hilton.

The White House announced the President declared major disasters exist in the following States:

- Oklahoma, as a result of severe storms on April 24;
- Oregon, as a result of an earthquake on March 25;
- Iowa, as a result of severe storms and flooding on March 26.

In addition, the President approved expanded emergencies in Alabama and North Carolina, following severe snowstorms on March 15 and March 13-17, respectively.

April 28

In the afternoon, the President had lunch with the Vice President. Later, he met with the National Governors Association Health Care Group.

In the evening, the President hosted a working dinner for Members of the House of Representatives.

April 29

In the afternoon, the President and Hillary Clinton met with King Juan Carlos I and Queen Sofia of Spain.

In the evening, the President attended a reception for G-7 members at Blair House.

April 30

In the morning, the President traveled to New Orleans, LA, and returned to Washington, DC, later that evening.

**Nominations
Submitted to the Senate**

The following list does not include promotions of members of the Uniformed Services, nominations to the Service Academies, or nominations of Foreign Service officers.

Submitted April 27

Kenneth S. Apfel,
of Maryland, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services, vice Arnold R. Tompkins, resigned.

Walter D. Broadnax,
of New York, to be Deputy Secretary of Health and Human Services, vice Kevin E. Moley, resigned.

Jean E. Hanson,
of New York, to be General Counsel for the Department of the Treasury, vice Jeanne S. Archibald, resigned.

Bruce C. Vladeck,
of New York, to be Administrator of the Health Care Financing Administration, vice Gail Roggin Wilensky.

Jeffrey Richard Shafer,
of New Jersey, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of the Treasury, vice Olin L. Wethington, resigned.

Michael B. Levy,
of Texas, to be a Deputy Under Secretary of the Treasury, vice Mary Catherine Sophos, resigned.

Joan E. Spero,
of New York, to be U.S. Alternate Governor of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development for a term of 5 years; U.S. Alternate Governor of the Inter-American Development Bank for a term of 5 years;

U.S. Alternate Governor of the African Development Bank for a term of 5 years; U.S. Alternate Governor of the African Development Fund; U.S. Alternate Governor of the Asian Development Bank; and U.S. Alternate Governor of the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development, vice Robert B. Zoellick.

George Edward Moose,
an Assistant Secretary of State, to be a member of the Board of Directors of the African Development Foundation for the remainder of the term expiring September 27, 1997, vice Herman Jay Cohen.

David T. Ellwood,
of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services, vice Martin H. Gerry.

Lorraine Allyce Green,
of the District of Columbia, to be Deputy Director of the Office of Personnel Management, vice Bill R. Phillips, resigned.

Elinor G. Constable,
of the District of Columbia, a career member of the Senior Foreign Service, class of Career Minister, to be Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs, vice E.U. Curtis Bohlen, resigned.

Jerry W. Bowen,
of Arkansas, to be Director of the National Cemetery System, Department of Veterans Affairs, vice Allen B. Clark, Jr., resigned.

Mary Lou Keener,
of Georgia, to be General Counsel, Department of Veterans Affairs, vice James Ashley Endicott, Jr., resigned.

Edward P. Scott,
of New Jersey, to be an Assistant Secretary of Veterans Affairs (Congressional Affairs), vice Sylvia Chavez Long, resigned.

D. Mark Catlett,
of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of Veterans Affairs (Finance and Information Resources Management), vice S. Anthony McCann, resigned.

Charlene Barshefsky,
of the District of Columbia, to be a Deputy
U.S. Trade Representative, with the rank of
Ambassador, vice Julius L. Katz.

Kathryn D. Sullivan,
of Texas, to be Chief Scientist of the National
Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration,
vice Sylvia Alice Earle, resigned.

Mortimer L. Downey,
of New York, to be Deputy Secretary of
Transportation, vice Arthur J. Rothkopf, re-
signed.

Rufus Hawkins Yerxa,
of the District of Columbia, to be a Deputy
U.S. Trade Representative, with the rank of
Ambassador.

Marshall S. Smith,
of California, to be Under Secretary of Edu-
cation (new position).

Augusta Souza Kappner,
of New York, to be Assistant Secretary for
Vocational and Adult Education, Depart-
ment of Education, vice Betsy Brand, re-
signed.

Thomas S. Williamson, Jr.,
of California, to be Solicitor for the Depart-
ment of Labor, vice Marshall Jordan Breger,
resigned.

Submitted April 28

Karl Frederick Inderfurth,
of North Carolina, to be the Alternate Rep-
resentative of the United States of America
for Special Political Affairs in the United Na-
tions, with the rank of Ambassador.

Erskine B. Bowles,
of North Carolina, to be Administrator of the
Small Business Administration, vice Patricia
F. Saiki, resigned.

Michael P. Huerta,
of California, to be Associate Deputy Sec-
retary of Transportation, vice Robert E. Mar-
tinez, resigned.

Rodney E. Slater,
of Arkansas, to be Administrator of the Fed-
eral Highway Administration, vice Thomas
D. Larson, resigned.

George J. Weise,
of Virginia, to be Commissioner of Customs
(new position).

George T. Frampton, Jr.,
of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant
Secretary for Fish and Wildlife, vice Mike
Hayden, resigned.

Daniel P. Beard,
of Washington, to be Commissioner of Rec-
lamation, vice Dennis B. Underwood, re-
signed.

Eugene Moos,
of Washington, to be Under Secretary of Ag-
riculture for International Affairs and Com-
modity Programs, vice Richard Thomas
Crowder, resigned.

Eugene Moos,
of Washington, to be a member of the Board
of Directors of the Commodity Credit Cor-
poration, vice Richard Thomas Crowder, re-
signed.

Maria Echaveste,
of New York, to be Administrator of the
Wage and Hour Division, Department of
Labor, vice Paula V. Smith, resigned.

Ruth R. Harkin,
of Iowa, to be President of the Overseas Pri-
vate Investment Corporation, vice Fred M.
Zeder II, resigned.

Thomas W. Payzant,
of California, to be Assistant Secretary for
Elementary and Secondary Education, De-
partment of Education, vice John T. Mac-
Donald, resigned.

David A. Longanecker,
of Colorado, to be Assistant Secretary for
Postsecondary Education, Department of
Education, vice Carolynn Reid-Wallace, re-
signed.

Roger W. Johnson,
of California, to be Administrator of General
Services, vice Richard G. Austin, resigned.

Daniel K. Tarullo,
of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Sec-
retary of State, vice Eugene J. McAllister, re-
signed.

Submitted April 29

Sheila Foster Anthony,
of Arkansas, to be an Assistant Attorney Gen-
eral, vice W. Lee Rawls, resigned.

Frank Hunger,
of Mississippi, to be an Assistant Attorney
General, vice Stuart M. Gerson, resigned.

Eleanor Acheson,
of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Attorney
General, vice Stephen J. Markman, resigned.

Walter Dellinger,
of North Carolina, to be an Assistant Attor-
ney General, vice Timothy E. Flanigan, re-
signed.

Anne Bingaman,
of New Mexico, to be an Assistant Attorney
General, vice James Franklin Rill, resigned.

Lani Guiner,
of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Attorney
General, vice John R. Dunne, resigned.

Steven S. Honigman,
of New York, to be General Counsel of the
Department of the Navy, vice Craig S. King,
resigned.

Joseph Shuldiner,
of California, to be an Assistant Secretary of
Housing and Urban Development, vice Jo-
seph G. Schiff, resigned.

Ashton B. Carter,
of Massachusetts, to be an Assistant Sec-
retary of Defense, vice David S.C. Chu, re-
signed.

Edwin Dorn,
of Texas, to be an Assistant Secretary of De-
fense, vice Christopher Jehn, resigned.

Edward L. Warner III,
of Virginia, to be an Assistant Secretary of
Defense, vice Colin Riley McMillan, re-
signed.

Anita K. Jones,
of Virginia, to be Director of Defense Re-
search and Engineering, vice Victor H. Reis,
resigned.

The following named persons to be members
of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commis-
sion for the terms indicated:

James John Hoecker, of Virginia, for the
remainder of the term expiring June 30,
1995, vice Branko Terzic, resigned.

William Lloyd Massey, of Arkansas, for the
remainder of the term expiring October
20, 1993, vice Martin Lewis Allday, re-
signed.

William Lloyd Massey, of Arkansas, for the
term expiring June 30, 1998 (reappoint-
ment).

Donald Farley Santa, of Connecticut, for
the term expiring June 30, 1997, vice
Charles A. Trabandt, term expired.

Ellen Weinberger Haas,
of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary
of Agriculture, vice Catherine Ann Bertini,
resigned.

Ellen Weinberger Haas,
of New York, to be a member of the Board
of Directors of the Commodity Credit Cor-
poration, vice Catherine Ann Bertini, re-
signed.

Marilyn A. Davis,
of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary
of Housing and Urban Development, vice
Jim E. Tarro, resigned.

Aida Alvarez,
of California, to be Director of the Office
of Federal Housing Enterprise Oversight,
Department of Housing and Urban Develop-
ment, for a term of 5 years (new position).

Withdrawn April 29

Sheila Foster Anthony,
of Arkansas, to be an Assistant Secretary of
Commerce, vice Mary Jo Jacobi, resigned,

which was sent to the Senate on April 19, 1993.

**Checklist
of White House Press Releases**

The following list contains releases of the Office of the Press Secretary that are neither printed as items nor covered by entries in the Digest of Other White House Announcements.

Released April 26

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Transcript of a press briefing by Director of Communications George Stephanopoulos

Statement on the establishment of a National Biological Survey

Released April 27

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Transcript of a press briefing by Director of Communications George Stephanopoulos

List of bipartisan Members of Congress meeting with the President on Bosnia

Released April 28

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Transcript of a press briefing by Director of Communications George Stephanopoulos

Released April 29

Transcript of a press briefing by Press Secretary Dee Dee Myers

Transcript of a press briefing by Director of Communications George Stephanopoulos

**Acts Approved
by the President**

Approved April 23

H.R. 1335 / Public Law 103-24
Making emergency supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, and for other purposes